DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 885 TM 870 215

AUTHOR McGrail, Janet; And Others
TITLE Looking at Schools. Instruments and Processes for School Analysis.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 87
CONTRACT 400-86-0003
NOTE 124p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; *Administrator Evaluation; Costs; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Measurement Techniques; Observation; Questionnaires; *School Community Relationship; School Effectiveness; Standardized Tests; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; Test Results; *Test Use

ABSTRACT

This directory reviews a variety of instruments that may be used by educators to assess the performance of students, teachers, and administrators; school climate effectiveness; and school-community relations. The instruments were selected on the basis of their sound technical quality, ease of availability, and proven utility. The student achievement tests included are: (1) California Achievement Tests; (2) Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; (3) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills; (4) Tests of Achievement and Proficiency; (5) Metropolitan Achievement Tests; (6) SRA Survey of Basic Skills; and (7) Stanford Achievement Tests. The following instruments are included for assessing teacher performance: (1) Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments; (2) Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation; (3) the Toledo Plan--Intern, Intervention, Evaluation; and (4) NTE Programs. Instruments included for the measurement of administrators performance are: (1) the Profile for Assessment of Leaders; (2 Missouri Performance Based Superintendent and Principal Evaluations; (3) the Profile of a School; (4) Administrator Management-by-Objectives Appraisal System; (5) the Evaluation of Principals as Instructional Leaders; and (6) the Assessment Center Project and Springfield Development Program. Instruments covered for the evaluation of school climate are: (1) Santa Clara School Effectiveness Program Surveys; (2) Illinois Quality Schools Index; (3) Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire; (4) School Self-Assessment Instruments; (5) Effective School Battery; (6) Classroom Environment Scale; (7) School Assessment Survey; (8) Organizational Climate Survey; (9) School Climate Improvement; (10) Quality of School Life; (11) Learning Environment Inventory/My Class Inventory; and (12) Middle Grades Assessment Program. The following instruments are included for evaluating school-community relations: (1) Parent Attitudes toward School Effectiveness Questionnaire; (2) Project ACCESS; and (3) NCCE Parent Involvement Process. Information about each instrument is categorized under developer, contact for materials and information, overview, description, use, results, costs, and comments (if applicable). (JAZ)

# LOOKING at schools

## Instruments and Processes for School Analysis

ED280885

Janet McGrail
Bruce L. Wilson
Joan L. Buttram
Gretchen B. Rossman

January 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Newcombe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 810 215

RBS
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
19123 • 4107
215 • 574 • 9300



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*This publication is based on work sponsored, wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under contract number 400-86-0003. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.*

## INTRODUCTION

An important step in any school improvement activity is to gather information about current conditions. This directory provides a resource for taking a careful, detailed look at all aspects of a school. It is a kind of consumer's guide from which educators can select instruments and processes to meet specific needs for information in a variety of areas. Use of the instruments and processes described in this directory can help to provide answers to such questions as:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of students?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of staff?
- How does the school "score" on characteristics of effective schools, as defined by the research literature?
- How does the school compare to others with similar background characteristics?
- Is the climate of the school conducive to student growth and staff commitment?
- How do parents feel about the quality of schooling their children are receiving?

Answers to questions such as these can be used in identifying possible areas for improvement, setting priorities for improvement activities, and planning specific activities like the introduction of a new instructional program or staff development effort. They can also serve as input to policy decisions about such issues as mandatory retirement age, course requirements, and parent involvement. Moreover, the process of looking at schools can have certain indirect benefits, like opening up communication in a school or increasing group cohesiveness.

This directory reviews a variety of instruments that may be used to assess student, teacher, and administrator performance, school climate and effectiveness, and school-community relations. It does not recommend specific instruments to be used, since district contexts and needs vary considerably. Nor does it specify how to organize, analyze, report, and use the information once it is collected. All of these tasks are much more difficult than information collection. The directory is not aimed at providing assistance in these areas. It is designed only as a resource for educators who are interested in collecting information related to one or more aspects of their school(s). Districts are encouraged to seek additional assistance as they begin the very complex undertaking of using information as part of the school improvement process.

### Who Should Use This Directory?

The directory is designed primarily for use by research and evaluation personnel in district offices, superintendents, school or district planning

committees, and principals. However, other individuals and groups who are interested in studying and assessing schools should also find the directory a valuable resource.

How Was the Directory Assembled?

Preparation of the directory started with the identification of the kinds of information that school districts do or should collect on a regular basis. Numerous school district reports were reviewed. In addition, the research literature on educational information systems was carefully studied. Based on these two sources, a preliminary list of information was compiled and categories developed. The categories were revised several times as instruments and processes directly linked to the use of specific instruments were identified. The final set of categories is reflected in the organization of the directory.

Instruments and processes in each category were identified through a variety of means:

- Computer searches of the educational research literature.
- Searches of such limited distribution publications as newsletters, programs of national and regional meetings of educators and educational researchers, and publications lists of R&D organizations.
- Reviews of publishers' catalogs.
- Reviews of school district reports.
- Contacts with research and evaluation personnel in district offices, with representatives of organizations known for instrument development, and with individuals engaged in work in relevant areas in universities and R&D organizations.

Instruments and processes selected initially by individual staff members were then reviewed and discussed at length by the entire project staff, and the final selections made.

What Were the Criteria for Selecting Instruments and Processes?

Three criteria were used in the final selection of instruments and processes to be included in the directory:

- Sound technical quality, as evidenced by (1) data on reliability and validity and/or (2) expert judgment.
- Ease of availability of the instruments and processes. The availability of supplemental materials and of assistance to schools and districts in administration, scoring, reporting, and/or the use of results was also considered.
- Proven utility to educators, as evidenced by widespread use and by the endorsement of users.

All of the instruments and processes described on the following pages were rated "good" or "excellent" on all three criteria. However, no entry is perfect. The instruments and processes selected are the best of those identified, based on the three criteria listed earlier.

Some instruments and processes that are unquestionably of sound quality were rejected because they are not readily available for use by schools and, consequently, there is inadequate evidence of their utility. Similarly, some instruments and processes that are viewed as useful by educators were not selected for inclusion because they are technically deficient.

How Is the Directory Organized?

The directory includes the following six sections:

I. Descriptive Information

II. Student Performance

III. Teacher Performance

IV. Administrator Performance

V. School Climate

VI. School-Community Relations

Section I, Descriptive Information, differs from the other five sections in that it is a list of the basic descriptive information that districts and schools might collect and report on a regular basis with respect to staff, students, curriculum/instructional program, finances, facilities and equipment, and community served. Sections II-VI include descriptions of instruments and processes. The instruments in Section II, Student Performance, are ones that are familiar to most educators. The instruments and processes in Sections III-VI measure areas that, until recently, have received little attention. Thus, most of the entries in these sections are less well known.

For each instrument and process included in the directory, the following information is presented:

- Developer
- Contact for materials and information
- Overview
- Description
- Use (i.e., administration, scoring/reporting, and follow-up services)

- Results (i.e., nature of the results schools receive and ways in which results can be used)
- Costs (either costs as of January 1987 or a referral to a readily available price list is given for each entry. All prices quoted are subject to change.)
- Comments (if applicable)

---

The authors would like to thank John A. Connolly, Thomas B. Corcoran, and Arnold W. Webb of Research for Better Schools, Inc. for their support and guidance in the preparation of this directory; William W. Cooley of the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh, Kenneth A. Sirotnik of the University of Washington, and Floraline I. Stevens of the Los Angeles Unified School District for their helpful comments on draft versions; Nadine Fernandez for assisting in the preparation of instrument descriptions in the student performance category; and Doris L. Harris for word processing. All artwork was done by Sharon H. Poggenpohl.

# I. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

This section of the directory contains a list of the descriptive information that school districts might collect, organize, analyze, report, and use on a regular basis. Such information can be useful in:

- Pinpointing areas of weakness that could be considered as the focus for improvement efforts.
- Pinpointing areas of strength that should be maintained and that could facilitate improvement.
- Providing an overall picture of a school or district.
- Identifying a school that may be a candidate for more intensive study.
- Guiding or reinforcing decisions regarding district or school policy.
- Corroborating or interpreting data collected for other purposes (e.g., assessment of a school's climate, evaluation of administrators).

Some of the information listed, like attendance and tenure data, will be more important than other information in school analysis and improvement efforts. However, all of the information on the following pages has proven utility, so districts should at least consider the collection and reporting of each item. Further, districts are encouraged to identify other kinds of information that may be useful in their particular activities.

Most of the information listed will already be available to districts in some form. Therefore, the primary task for a district will probably not be the collection of data, but rather the organization, analysis, reporting, and use of previously gathered information.

The lists on the following pages are intended only to stimulate thinking about descriptive information that would be useful in analysis and improvement activities. No attempt was made to suggest formats or formulas for collecting specific information. Definitions are not proposed for terms that are now defined in different (and sometimes inappropriate) ways from site to site. Guidelines are not recommended for the level (i.e., individual, classroom, grade, school, district) at which data can most productively be reported and analyzed. Further, no suggestions are made for analyses that might be done relating descriptive information to other data, such as student performance and attitudes. All of these tasks are beyond the scope of this directory, and districts are encouraged to seek further assistance in these areas. The following lists, however, do represent a starting point in the development of an information system that could prove invaluable to school systems in their everyday operations, as well as in efforts designed to bring about improvement.

A. Staff*

All Staff

- Number
  - total
  - by job category
- Sex
- Age
- Race/ethnicity
- Employment status (full-time/part-time)
- Home address, telephone number, emergency number**

Instructional Staff

- Educational background
- Employment history
  - years in teaching/administration
  - years in district
  - years in building
- Subject-matter expertise
- Special certifications
- Professional development activities
- Total full-time equivalents allocated to instruction in subject-matter areas
- Salaries
  - range
  - median
- Number of first-year teachers
- Number of teachers new to the building this year
- Number of teachers not returning to the building this year

---

*Staff performance is dealt with in Sections III and IV, staff attitudes in Section V.

**These items can be reported at the individual level only.

- Attendance/absenteeism of teachers
- Teacher-to-student ratio
- Average class size
- Length of stay of last three principals
- Aide-to-teacher ratio
- Counselor-to-student ratio
- School psychologist-to-student ratio

B. Students*

- Number
  - total
  - by grade
  - by course
  - by program
- Sex
- Age
- Race/ethnicity
- Language dominance
- Parents' education
- Parents' occupation
- Family composition
- Medical history**
- Home address, telephone number, emergency number**
- Eligibility for reduced price or free lunches
- Eligibility for subsidized transportation
- Attendance/absenteeism
- Tardiness
- Suspension rate
- Dropout rate
- Expulsion rate
- Transiency rate
- Course-taking patterns
- Participation in extracurricular activities
  - in sports
  - in other activities

---

*Student achievement and other student outcomes are dealt with in Section II, student attitudes in Section V.

**These items can be reported at the individual level only.

C. Curriculum/Instructional Program

- Courses offered
- Remedial and compensatory education programs
- Special education programs
- Instructional groupings (i.e., homogeneous or heterogeneous ability groups) and programs of study (e.g., academic, general)
- Curriculum packages and texts used
- Assessment instruments and procedures used

D. Finances

- Total instructional budget (regular and special funds)
- Cost per pupil
- Expenditures (e.g., payroll, materials and supplies, equipment, maintenance, transportation, safety and security)
- Vandalism costs (above regular maintenance and security costs)

E. Facilities and Equipment

- Age of school building
- Number of classrooms
  - total
  - in use
- Square feet of classroom space
  - total
  - in use
- Library
  - student capacity
  - number of books
  - number of periodical subscriptions
- Other facilities (e.g., science laboratory, playground, gymnasium, cafeteria)
- Number and brand of microcomputers used for instruction
- Software packages used for instruction
- Other special resources used for instruction (e.g., laboratory equipment, VCRs)
- Number and brand of microcomputers used for noninstructional purposes
- Software packages used for noninstructional purposes

F. Community

- Age
- Educational background
- Percentage of families with school-age children
- Family income
  - range
  - median
- Percentage of homeowners
- Property values
  - range
  - median
- Percentage of families living in public housing
- Percentage of students attending public and nonpublic schools
- Race/ethnicity
- Parent association membership

## II. STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Although a wide variety of alternatives can be used by districts to assess and monitor student academic progress (e.g., teacher-developed tests, curriculum-based tests, evaluation of student work samples), the focus of this directory is commercially available achievement test batteries. However, districts are strongly encouraged to use a variety of instruments and procedures to assess and monitor student achievement. Further, they are encouraged to explore alternatives for assessing achievement in areas other than those traditionally measured by standardized tests -- areas like writing and critical thinking. And finally, districts are urged to collect, report, and use data on student outcomes other than achievement scores. These other outcomes include:

- Grades by subject area
- Outcomes associated with special programs (e.g., English fluency as the outcome of an ESL program)
- Promotions/retentions
- Attainment of state graduation requirements
- Graduations from high school
- PSAT/SAT/ACT scores
- Advanced placements
- Honor roll attainments
- Scholarships - academic and athletic
- Other awards
- Post-secondary plans
- Post-secondary activities

The achievement test batteries included in the directory are the most commonly used testing packages. They are:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| • California Achievement Tests (CAT) | II-3 |
| • Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) | II-6 |
| • Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) | II-9 |
| • Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) | II-12 |

| | Page |
|---|---|
| • Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) | II-15 |
| • SRA Survey of Basic Skills (SBS) | II-18 |
| • Stanford Achievement Tests | II-21 |


For additional information about these tests, individuals are encouraged to consult the following: Mitchell, J. V., Jr. (Ed.). (1985). The ninth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

## CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

CTB/McGraw-Hill

DEVELOPER

CTB/McGraw-Hill
Order Service Center
Del Monte Research Park
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
800-538-9547

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The California Achievement Tests (CAT), Forms E/F, are a series of parallel, norm-referenced tests for kindergarten through grade 12. The series, normed in 1984-85, is designed to measure achievement in basic skills frequently found in state and district curricula. The tests provide information about the relative ranking of students against a norm group, in addition to specific information about the instructional needs of students.

DESCRIPTION

The subject areas measured by the CAT E/F are reading, spelling, language, mathematics, and study skills. Optional tests are available for science and social studies. Items were developed based on reviews of current curriculum guides from state departments of education and large school districts throughout the country, as well as the content of recently published textbook series and instructional programs.

The reading test (K.0-12.9) measures word analysis, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. In addition, visual recognition, sound recognition, and oral comprehension are tested at K.0-K.9. The spelling test (1.6-12.9) assesses a student's knowledge of rules for consonants, vowels, and various structural forms. Language mechanics items (1.6-12.9) measure capitalization, punctuation, and proofreading skills, while language expression items (K.0-12.9) measure skills in using various parts of speech, forming and organizing sentences and paragraphs, identifying and

developing topic sentences, and writing for clarity. Items testing mathematics computation skills are available for K.6 to 12.9. Mathematics concepts and applications items (K.0-12.9) test reasoning skills needed for practical problem-solving. The study skills test (3.6-12.9) measures the ability to locate and process information, take notes and outline, and organize and synthesize information.

The optional science test (1.6-12.9) includes items that measure understanding of scientific language, concepts, and methods of inquiry in the disciplines of botany, zoology, ecology, physics, chemistry, and earth, ocean, and space sciences. The optional social studies test (1.6-12.9) measures understanding of geography, economics, history, political science, sociology, and interdisciplinary studies.

There are 11 overlapping levels in Form E for kindergarten through grade 12. Form F has eight levels from 2.6 to 12.9. An additional advanced level has been added to provide better content coverage for high school.

Locator and practice tests are also included in the test series. Locator tests provide a reliable way to match students in the same grade with different levels of the series. Practice tests are designed to familiarize students with taking standardized tests.

The CAT has undergone many tests of validity and reliability. Forms E/F of the test series were normed in 1984-85 with a sample of approximately 300,000 students in grades K-12 from public, private, and Catholic schools. Validity and reliability are verified by the norming and other studies conducted on the tests. More details about these studies can be found in technical bulletins available from the publisher.

Various reference guides are also available for the CAT series. Included are a class management guide, an examiner's manual, a test coordinator's handbook, and multi-

level norm books. Answer sheets are available for hand or machine scoring. Also available are reusable or nonreusable test books.

USE

It is recommended that the CAT be administered by classroom teachers to their own students at all grade levels. Districts can give one or more of the tests (e.g., reading, language, mathematics). Administering the entire test series requires from 154 minutes in kindergarten to 408 minutes in grades 3.6-12.9. All tests are timed and will require several days to complete at most grade levels. In most cases, the test is administered in the early fall or late spring.

Test results can be obtained by either hand or machine scoring the answer sheets. Scoring can be completed by the district, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

RESULTS

The district may choose how the scores will be reported. The following options are available: raw score, local or national percentile, local or national stanine, grade equivalent, normal curve equivalent, scale score, and objectives mastery score. Test results can be prepared at a variety of levels, including individual student, classroom, grade level, school, or district.

The wide range of reporting formats available allows districts to use the results in a variety of ways. Test scores can be used to chart the progress of an individual student, class, grade, school, or district.

COSTS

CTB/McGraw-Hill publishes an annual catalog of the costs of its products and services. Regional representatives are also available to assist districts in their selection.

## COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

DEVELOPER

CTB/McGraw Hill

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

CTB/McGraw Hill
Order Service Center
Del Monte Research Park
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
800-538-9547

OVERVIEW

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Forms U/V, are a series of parallel, norm-referenced, objectives-based tests for kindergarten through grade 12. The tests measure achievement in the basic skills commonly found in state and district curricula. The tests were originally published in 1968. Forms U/V represent the third and most recent edition and were normed during the 1980-81 school year. Test results are used to monitor individual student progress, as well as to assess the effectiveness of the instructional program at the classroom, grade, school, or district level.

DESCRIPTION

The CTBS measures basic skills in reading, language, spelling, mathematics, reference skills, science, and social studies. CTBS U/V items were written to both content categories and broad process classifications. The content categories were defined by examining current state and district curriculum guides, published texts and instructional programs, and criterion-referenced assessment instruments. Derived in part from Bloom's taxonomy, the process classifications include recall, explicit information skills, inferential reasoning, and evaluation.

The reading test (K.0-12.9) measures oral comprehension (at the lower grade levels only), word attack, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The language test (K.6-12.9) assesses both mechanics (e.g., capitalization, punctuation) and expression (e.g.,

parts of speech, organization). Spelling items (1.6-12.9) measure application of rules for consonants, vowels, and various structural forms. Mathematics computations and applications are covered by the mathematics test (K.0-12.9). The reference skills test (3.6-12.9) assesses student skills in finding and using information. The science test items (1.6-12.9) reflect content from the physical and life sciences, and measure student understanding of scientific language, concepts, and methods of inquiry. The social studies test items (1.6-12.9) cover the disciplines of geography, economics, history, political science, and sociology.

There are ten overlapping levels in Form U and six in Form V. Form U levels are recommended for grade levels K.0-12.9, while Form V levels cover grade levels 1.6-12.9. Additional levels have been added between kindergarten and grade 1 and between grades 3 and 4 in order to give special attention to changes in student growth patterns and to instructional content, respectively.

The test series also includes locator tests and practice tests. Locator tests provide a reliable way to match students in the same grade with different levels of the test series. Practice tests give students experience in taking standardized tests.

Numerous validity and reliability studies have been conducted on the CTBS. The test series was normed in 1981-82 with a sample of approximately 250,000 students in grades K-12 from public, private, and Catholic schools. Results from the norming and other studies support the validity and reliability of the CTBS. A technical report, available from the publisher, summarizes the results of many of the studies.

A number of reference guides have been developed for the test series, including an examiner's manual, norm books, a class management guide, a test coordinator's handbook, and an evaluator's handbook. All

of these documents can be obtained from the publisher. In addition, consumable and nonconsumable test booklets and hand- or machine-scoring answer sheets are available.

USE

Administration of the CTBS by classroom teachers to their students at all grade levels is recommended. Districts can elect to give one or more of the tests (e.g., reading, language, mathematics). Test administration lengths for the entire series range from 68 minutes (kindergarten) to 290 minutes (grades 3.6-12.9). All tests are timed. At most grade levels, the testing will require several days to complete. Although the tests can be administered anytime during the school year, they are most frequently administered in the early fall or late spring.

Completed answer sheets can be scored by hand or machine. The tests can be scored by the district itself, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

RESULTS

Test scores can be reported in the following formats: raw score, scale score, grade equivalent, local or national percentile, normal curve equivalent, local or national stanine, and objective mastery score. Reports of one or more of these types of scores can be prepared by individual student, classroom, grade level, school, or district, or any other student grouping.

Test results can be used in various ways, depending on the reporting format selected. For example, test results can be used to assess individual student progress. They can also be used to assess the performance of classrooms, grade levels, schools, or districts.

COSTS

CTB/McGraw Hill publishes an annual catalog of the costs of its products and services. Regional representatives are also available to assist districts in their selection.

## IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

The Riverside Publishing Company — DEVELOPER

The Riverside Publishing Company
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Chicago, IL 60631
800-323-9540

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), parallel forms G/H, are a comprehensive achievement battery originally published in 1935. The latest edition, normed in the 1984-85 school year, comprises an assessment program for students in kindergarten through grade 9. It is designed to provide diagnostic information about how well students are learning basic skills.

DESCRIPTION

The ITBS measures skills in listening, word analysis, vocabulary, reading/reading comprehension, language, work-study, and mathematics. Supplemental tests are available in social studies, science, writing, and listening. Items for the tests were developed based on reviews of current instructional materials, consultation with national curriculum committees, and results of fairness and item tryout studies.

The listening and word analysis tests are designed for the early primary and primary grades only (K.1-3.5). The reading test measures words and word attack skills (K.8-1.9), pictures, sentences, picture stories/stories (all for K.8-3.5), and reading comprehension (K.8-9). The vocabulary test assesses students' skills in grades K.1-9. The language test (K.1-9) measures skills in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage and expression. The work-study test (1.7-9) assesses students' abilities to use visual and reference materials. The mathematics test (K.1-9) assesses knowledge of mathematics concepts, problem-solving, and computation. Optional social studies and science tests are

available for grades 1.7-9. The supplemental writing and listening tests can be administered to grades 3-9.

The ITBS has ten overlapping levels, generally corresponding to the chronological age of students. Levels 5-6 (K.1-1.9) are only available in Form G, while Levels 7-14 (1.7-9) are available in both Forms G and H. Practice tests are included for grades K.1-1.9 to familiarize students with taking standardized tests. For all other levels, practice tests may be ordered separately.

There are two batteries for Levels 7-14: Basic and Complete. The Basic Battery includes fewer tests than the Complete and is recommended when test time is limited. Levels 5-6 are only available in a Basic Battery.

The ITBS has undergone numerous reliability and validity studies. The test series was normed in the 1984-85 school year. The sample of 127,000 students was drawn from public, private, and Catholic schools across the country. Results of this and other studies support the validity and reliability of the ITBS. A technical summary available from the publisher provides more detailed information on the studies.

Additional reference materials are available to supplement the test series. Included are teacher's guides, norms booklets, and a manual for school administrators. Hand- and machine-scorable booklets are available for most levels, as are reusable or consumable test booklets and answer sheets.

USE

Administration of the ITBS to all grades is recommended. In most cases, teachers will want to administer the tests to their own students. Districts may choose between the Basic or Complete Battery. Test administration time varies from 125 to 256 minutes, not including the optional tests. At most levels, the test series will take several days to complete. Most often, the ITBS is given in the fall or spring.

Results may be obtained by hand or machine scoring. The tests may be scored by the district, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

## RESULTS

Test results for the ITBS can be reported in a variety of formats, including raw score, grade equivalent, standard score, national percentile, normal curve, and stanine. In addition, norms are available for large city, Catholic school, high or low socioeconomic areas, and local areas.

The results can be used in a variety of ways, depending on the format chosen. Test results may be used to trace the development of a student or to highlight a student's strengths and weaknesses. Scores may also be used to assess class, grade, school, or district progress.

## COSTS

The Riverside Publishing Company publishes an annual test resource catalog, which lists prices for materials and services. The catalog is available from the company or from regional representatives.

## TESTS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFICIENCY

The Riverside Publishing Company — DEVELOPER

The Riverside Publishing Company
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Chicago, IL 60631
800-323-9540

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), parallel forms G/H, comprise an assessment program for students in grades 9-12. The TAP measures student progress in basic skills and basic curricular areas. The test series was normed concurrently with the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), during the 1984-85 school year. It is intended to be used with the ITBS to provide continuous coverage of the educational development of students as they progress through the school system.

DESCRIPTION

The TAP assesses basic skills in reading comprehension, mathematics, written expression, using sources of information, social studies, and science. The test content represents the diversity of course offerings in secondary schools and the wide range of student goals. The items were written from a systematic analysis of state and local courses of study and instructional materials and methods.

The reading comprehension test measures the student's ability to define vocabulary and to read and interpret. Mathematics tests include items in general and applied mathematics, algebra, geometry, and consumer mathematics. Computational, conceptual, and problem-solving skills are also measured. The written expression test includes items in spelling and language mechanics. The using sources of information test calls for students to read and interpret graphs, maps, charts, and reference materials. The social studies test draws items from the disciplines of economics, geography, political science, history, and anthropology.

The science test includes items in general science, earth and space science, biology, physics, and chemistry. In addition, there are two optional tests: listening and writing. Each subject area is tested at each grade level.

The TAP is available in a Basic Battery and a Complete Battery. The Basic Battery includes only the reading comprehension, mathematics, written expression, and using sources of information tests. The Complete Battery includes all tests in the series. Both TAP batteries include an optional 15-item questionnaire. This questionnaire elicits information about students' attitudes toward school subjects, their use of leisure time, and their post-high school plans.

The TAP has four levels (15-18), which correspond to the four high school grades (9-12). All levels are available in both Forms G and H.

A number of studies of reliability and validity have been conducted on the TAP. The TAP was normed in the 1984-85 school year on a sample of 52,000 students from public, private, and Catholic schools across the country. The results of norming and other studies provide evidence of the reliability and validity of the test series. These results are presented in detail in a preliminary technical summary available from the publisher.

A variety of other supplemental reference materials are also available, including teacher's guides, norms booklets, directions for administration, and a manual for school administrators. Answer sheets for either hand or machine scoring and reusable test booklets can be obtained.

USE

Administration of the TAP to all grades is recommended. The test can be administered in either classroom or large group settings. Districts may choose between the Complete and Basic Batteries. The time limit for administering the Basic Battery is 160

minutes and, for the Complete Battery, 240 minutes. The optional listening and writing tests take an additional 40 minutes each.

Test answer sheets may be hand- or machine-scored by the district, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

RESULTS

Test results for the TAP can be reported in a variety of formats, including raw score, standard score, grade equivalent, national percentile rank, normal curve equivalent score, and stanine. Local and special norms (large cities, Catholic, high and low socioeconomic schools) are also available. An Applied Proficiency Skill score, based on items in both the Basic and Complete Batteries that measure skills needed in adult life, can be provided. Information from the optional questionnaire can be printed on score reports.

Depending on the format chosen, the test results can be used in a variety of ways. Results can be used to track individual student gains or to chart the progress of a class, grade, school, or district.

COSTS

The Riverside Publishing Company publishes an annual test resource catalog, which lists prices for materials and services. The catalog is available from the company or from regional representatives.

## METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

**DEVELOPER**

The Psychological Corporation
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

**CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION**

The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952
800-228-0752

**OVERVIEW**

The Metropolitan Achievement Tests, sixth edition (MAT6), parallel forms L/M, are designed to measure the achievement of students in the major skill and content areas of the school curriculum. The tests first appeared in the nation's schools in the 1930s. They were normed most recently in the 1984-85 school year. The MAT6 can provide a comprehensive assessment of student achievement in kindergarten through grade 12. Results can be used in assessing individual progress, as well as in managing and planning instructional programs.

**DESCRIPTION**

The battery contains tests in reading, mathematics, language, science, and social studies. Items were developed based on extensive analyses of leading textbook series, state guidelines, and school system syllabi.

The reading test measures the student's vocabulary (K.5-12.9), word recognition skills (K.5-4-9), and reading comprehension skills (K.5-12.9). The mathematics test (1.5-9.9) assesses knowledge of mathematics concepts, problem-solving, and computation. Built into both the reading and mathematics tests is a diagnostic feature that can estimate the optimal level at which a student can learn.

The language test includes two subtests: spelling (1.5-12.9) and language (K.0-12.9). The spelling subtest measures the student's ability to spell words from standard spelling lists. The language subtest focuses on listening comprehension,

punctuation, capitalization, usage, study skills, and written expression.

In the science test (1.5-12.9), items are drawn from the physical, earth, space, and life sciences, while social studies (1.5-12.9) covers geography, economics, history, political science, and human behaviors. Both the science and social studies tests measure content, as well as one of four behaviors based on Bloom's taxonomy: knowledge, comprehension, inquiry skills, and critical analysis.

The battery has eight overlapping levels (K.0-12.9) in Form L and six in Form M (1.5-12.9). Practice tests are included at each level to familiarize students with standardized testing formats.

The MAT6 also includes three diagnostic batteries (reading, mathematics, and language) that provide criterion-referenced measurement in greater depth, using a system of objectives coordinated with the battery just described.

An optional MAT6 writing test measures the writing achievement of students in grades 2-12. It is a norm-referenced test with picture prompts that elicit descriptive and narrative writing. The writing sample is holistically scored. When combined with the language tests, the writing test rounds out the assessment of a student's achievement in communication.

The MAT6 has undergone various reliability and validity studies. The tests were normed in the 1984-85 school year with a sample of over 250,000 K-12 students from public and nonpublic schools of various sizes and socioeconomic levels across the country. Results of this study and others support the reliability and validity of the test series. More detailed information about the studies is summarized in a preliminary technical manual available from the publisher.

Other available materials include directions for administering, norms booklets,

a teacher's manual for interpreting, an administrator's guide, and an evaluator's handbook. In addition, hand- or machine-scorable answer sheets and reusable and nonreusable test books can be obtained.

USE

It is recommended that the MAT6 be administered by classroom teachers to their students at all grade levels. Required test administration time varies from 98 minutes in kindergarten to 254 minutes in grades 3.5-4.9. The optional writing test takes 20 minutes to administer. Usually the tests are administered over several days. Most frequently, MAT6 tests are given in mid-October and mid-April.

Completed answer sheets can be hand- or machine-scored by the district, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

RESULTS

In addition to raw scores, the MAT6 battery yields a full range of derived scores, including scaled scores; national, nonpublic, and local percentile ranks; stanines; normal curve equivalents; and grade equivalents. Scores for Higher Order Thinking Skills and Research Skills can be derived from combinations of items across various MAT6 tests.

A variety of score reports can be obtained, including individual reports; group summary reports; individual, group, and class item analyses; pupil profiles; and class instructional reports. The results can be used to follow individual progress or to help teachers and administrators manage and plan instructional programs.

COSTS

The Psychological Corporation publishes an annual catalog, which includes a product and service directory complete with prices. The catalog may be obtained from the company or from regional representatives.

## SRA SURVEY OF BASIC SKILLS

Science Research Associates, Inc.

**DEVELOPER**

Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
312-984-7000

**CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION**

**OVERVIEW**

The Survey of Basic Skills (SBS), Forms P/Q, is a series of parallel, norm-referenced, objectives-based tests for kindergarten through grade 12. The tests are designed to measure the general academic achievement level at which students are learning what is taught in school. The SBS was normed during the 1983-84 school year. Scores can be used to track individual student progress, as well as to monitor the effectiveness of the instructional program at the classroom, grade, school, and district levels.

**DESCRIPTION**

The SBS tests a student's skills in reading, mathematics, language, reference materials, social studies, science, and applied skills. Test items are based on the objectives most commonly taught across the country.

The reading test measures decoding and auditory discrimination (K.7-1.1), letters and sounds (K.7-3.1), listening comprehension (K.7-2.1), and vocabulary and reading comprehension (1.7-12.7). The mathematics test covers math concepts (K.7-12.7), computation (1.7-12.7), and word problem-solving (4.7-12.7). Language includes items on mechanics (1.7-12.7), usage (2.7-12.7), and spelling (2.7-12.7). The reference materials items (3.7-12.7) test a student's research and dictionary skills; ability to distinguish parts of a book; use of maps, tables, and graphs; life skills; and employment/money management ability. The social studies items (4.7-12.7) assess the student's skills in recall, interpretation, and reasoning. The science items (4.7-12.7) measure the student's recall/

recognition, comprehension/application, and inquiry skills. The applied skills test (9.1-12.7) focuses on employment, consumer affairs, health and safety, and community resources.

Eight levels of the SBS were developed and standardized for grades K.7-12.7 in Form P. Five levels for grades 3.7-12.7 are included in Form Q.

Practice items are included at each level to familiarize students with taking standardized tests.

Various reliability and validity studies have been conducted on the SBS. The test series was normed in 1983-84 with a stratified random sample of over 175,000 students from public and nonpublic schools of various sizes and socioeconomic levels across the country. Results of this study and others support the SBS' reliability and validity. More information about these studies is available in a technical information booklet available from the publisher.

SRA provides the following reference guides for the test series: norms and conversion tables and answer keys, and an examiner's manual. Machine-scorable booklets are used with students in grades K-3. Students in grades 4-12 use nonconsumable test booklets and separate machine-scorable answer sheets. SBS Forms P/Q can also be hand-scored.

USE

The SBS should be administered by classroom teachers to their students in all grade levels. Total testing time varies by level. Tests in grades K.7-1.1 take 103 minutes, while grades 4.7-12.7 take 278 minutes. In most cases, the tests will take several days to complete. The tests are usually administered in early fall or late spring.

Test results can be scored by hand or machine. Scoring can be done by the district, the test publisher, or another licensed scoring service.

RESULTS

Scores available for the SBS include raw scores, national and local percentiles, scaled scores, and grade-equivalents.

A wide variety of reports are available for use by teachers, administrators, and parents. These reports include narrative reports, individual skills profiles, group summary reports, individual and group item analyses, and reports for special groups of students (e.g., Chapter 1 students, students who have been in the district since their schooling began). The results can be used to monitor individual, class, grade, school, or district progress.

COSTS

SRA provides price lists of its test series and scoring services. This information is available from SRA or from an SRA representative.

## STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

DEVELOPER

The Psychological Corporation
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

The Psychological Corporation
555 Academic Court
San Antonio, TX 78204-0952
800-228-0752

OVERVIEW

The Stanford Achievement Tests, Forms E/F, are a series of parallel, norm-referenced, objectives-based tests for kindergarten through grade 13. The test series, originally published in 1926 and normed most recently in the 1981-82 school year, provides a continuous assessment of achievement by means of a common scaled score system. The series includes the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), second edition, (K.0-1.9); Stanford Achievement Test, seventh edition, (1.5-9.9); and Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK), second edition, (8.0-13). The test results can help diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses and evaluate program effectiveness at the classroom, grade, school, or district level.

DESCRIPTION

The Stanford series is an overall measure of achievement in the basic skills of reading, mathematics, language arts, environment, science, and social studies. In order to ensure that the test content would be valid, curriculum materials and textbooks in each subject area were studied, along with syllabi, state and large city curriculum guidelines, and research literature pertaining to children's learning, experience, and vocabulary.

The reading test measures a student's knowledge of sounds and letters (auditory and symbol perception) and listening to words and stories (K.0-1.9), word reading (K.0-3.9), reading comprehension (K.5-13), word study skills (1.5-7.9), listening comprehension (1.5-9.9), and vocabulary

(1.5-13). The language arts test assesses spelling skills (1.5-13) and knowledge of language/English (3.5-13). The mathematics test includes four subtests: concepts of numbers (1.5-9.9), computation (1.5-9.9), applications (1.5-9.9), and mathematics (K.0-1.9). The environment test (K.0-3.9) contains items about the social and natural environments. The science test (3.5-13) assesses the student's knowledge of the physical and biological sciences and measures the student's inquiry skills. The social science test (3.5-13) covers the areas of geography, history, anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and inquiry skills. Separate norm-referenced scores are provided for math problem-solving and "using information" skills.

There are ten overlapping levels spanning grades K.0-13, with Forms E/F at each level of Stanford and TASK. A Basic Battery (3.5-13) includes all tests except science and social studies. The Complete Battery contains all tests at all levels.

A number of validity and reliability studies have been conducted on the Stanford Achievement Test series. A sample of approximately 250,000 students from different size school districts, varying socioeconomic levels, and various geographic regions was used in the norming of the Stanford series in 1981-82. The students in the sample were in grades K-12 in public and nonpublic schools. Additional information on norming and other studies that provide evidence of the series' reliability and validity is presented in a technical data report available from the publisher.

Several types of support materials have been published for the Stanford series. They include teacher's directions for administering, norms booklets, indexes of instructional objectives, guides for classroom planning, a handbook of instructional strategies, and a guide for organizational planning. The Stanford series has consumable test books and hand- or machine-scorable answer sheets.

USE

It is recommended that the Stanford series be given by classroom teachers to their students at all levels. The test-taking time for the series ranges from 130 minutes (K.0-K.9) to 315 minutes (4.5-7.9). Most often, the tests are administered over several days. Test administration usually takes place in the early fall or late spring.

Results can be computed by hand or machine in the district, by the test publisher, or by another licensed scoring service. The district may choose different scoring packages, depending on their particular needs.

RESULTS

Different types of scores have been developed for the Stanford series. Among them are raw scores, scaled scores, individual and group percentile ranks and stanines, grade-equivalent scores, normal curve equivalent scores, achievement/ability comparisons, and content cluster performance categories.

A variety of reports are available at the individual student, class, grade, school, or district level. The particular scores and reports selected depend on the purposes for which the tests were given. The tests may be used for instructional planning, administrative decision-making, or individual or group assessment.

COSTS

The Psychological Corporation publishes an annual catalog, which includes a product and service directory complete with prices. The catalog may be obtained from the company or from regional representatives.

## III. TEACHER PERFORMANCE

This section of the directory contains descriptions of instruments and processes designed to assess teacher performance. Teacher performance can be assessed in three ways: (1) ratings of teacher performance, (2) administration of proficiency tests of subject knowledge and/or teaching methods, and (3) observations of teacher classroom performance. Another method, once in common use, calls for teachers' evaluations to be based on their students' test results. Fortunately, research-based criteria are replacing test scores as a basis for evaluation.

Assessing performance through ratings is the approach most commonly used by school districts today. Ratings usually are based on the review of lesson plans, classroom observation, and discussions with the teacher on his/her performance. Proficiency tests are becoming more common as local and state education agencies respond to accountability movements. To date, observation systems have been designed primarily for research purposes; their use in school districts to monitor teacher performance is limited. One note of caution -- teaching is a complex process. Probably no evaluation approach can provide a complete picture of a teacher's performance in the classroom and in the school.

The following instruments and processes are included in the directory:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| • Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAI) | III-2 |
| • Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation | III-6 |
| • The Toledo Plan - Intern, Intervention, Evaluation | III-9 |
| • NTE Programs | III-12 |


The first three entries involve rating systems. The NTE Programs are proficiency tests.

## GEORGIA TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

DEVELOPER

Teacher Assessment Unit
Georgia Department of Education

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Lester Solomon, Director
Teacher Assessment Unit
Georgia Department of Education
1858 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-656-2556

OVERVIEW

Since 1980, beginning teachers in Georgia (and since 1985, all teachers new to the state) have been required to demonstrate competency in eight teaching skills considered minimally essential for certification. The assessment process provides feedback about the extent to which a teacher's classroom performance meets established expectations. The process also provides for assistance to teachers in improving basic teaching skills through staff development and supportive supervision.

DESCRIPTION

The Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAI), the main instruments in the Georgia assessment process, measure teacher performance on eight generic competencies derived from research on teaching and validated by educators in the state. Each competency is further divided into more specific indicators. The competencies and number of indicators for each are as follows: (1) plans instruction to achieve selected objectives (4 indicators); (2) obtains information about the needs and progress of learners (3 indicators); (3) demonstrates acceptable written and oral expression and knowledge of the subject (4 indicators); (4) organizes time, space, materials, and equipment for instruction (3 indicators); (5) communicates with learners (4 indicators); (6) demonstrates appropriate instructional methods (4 indicators); (7) maintains a positive learning climate (4 indicators); and (8) maintains appropriate classroom behavior (4 indicators). In

addition, four descriptors for each indicator define more clearly the specific teacher knowledge, skills, or behavior being assessed.

A two-part Planning/Observation Instrument was developed to collect teacher performance data on the eight competencies. The Planning section is based on a lesson plan portfolio prepared by the teacher and is used to assess the teacher's competence in planning for instruction, evaluating learner progress, and using acceptable written expression. It includes a Class Description Sheet that provides background information on the teacher's classroom. The Observation section is based on independent classroom observation and focuses on content-related interaction with learners, classroom organization and management, use of instructional methods, and assessment of learner progress. The Planning/Observation Instrument is completed independently by three trained observers -- an external data collector, a school administrator, and a peer teacher. The three observers score the teacher's level of performance on each of the competencies using the four descriptors associated with each indicator.

There are two optional areas included in the Georgia evaluation system -- professional standards and student perceptions. The competencies and number of indicators for each in the professional standards instrument are as follows: (1) meets professional obligations (3 indicators); (2) works cooperatively with colleagues, administrators, and community members (3 indicators); and (3) engages in professional self-development (3 indicators). The student perceptions instrument has 35 items that are directly related to the indicators and descriptors in the Planning/Observation Instrument.

Separate forms have been developed for the professional standards and student perceptions areas. The professional standards form is completed by peer teachers/administrators. Scores on the four descriptors are given for each of the nine indicators.

In the student perceptions area, all students in grade 3 and above rate their teachers on all 35 items using a three-point scale.

Numerous validity and reliability studies have been conducted on these instruments. They have been correlated with pupil perceptions of the school climate/learning environment, pupil engagement rates during instruction, and mean achievement gains. Research findings demonstrate that the instruments are significantly correlated with outcomes that one would expect from effective teaching. Reliability estimates, calculated from a variety of studies, are satisfactory.

All of the Georgia forms and procedures are described in the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments manual, which is available from the Department of Education.

USE

The Georgia instruments are used over the course of a single school year. The time necessary to complete each instrument varies. Classroom observations require one full class period. Training is necessary for evaluators using the system. The state currently requires 50 hours of instruction and practice in the field for evaluators. The Georgia Department of Education is willing to arrange for training to other districts, either at one of its own regional centers or at the adopting site. Technical assistance in scoring is available from an external consultant.

RESULTS

Teachers receive performance feedback on each competency and its associated indicators and descriptors. All scores are displayed on a computer profile, along with a summary for each competency.

The profiles can be used by teachers and administrators to identify strengths and weaknesses of individuals or groups of teachers. Once these are identified, appropriate staff development can be provided to assist teachers in improving their skills.

COSTS

The Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments manual is available from the Department of Education for $7.50. The cost of implementing the Georgia system is dependent on the size of the district. Training materials and assistance are available on a cost recovery basis.

COMMENTS

The Georgia system has undergone several revisions over time. The system described here is its most recent version, published in 1986.

## MISSOURI PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION

DEVELOPER

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Turner Tyson, Director
Teacher Education and Certification
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314-751-3847

OVERVIEW

In Spring 1983, Missouri legislators mandated a comprehensive performance evaluation for all teachers. In response, the state's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in conjunction with an appointed committee, developed a "model" performance evaluation system. The system relies heavily on the identification of effective teaching behaviors from current research. This system, or some modification, has been adopted by the majority of school districts across the state in evaluating the performance of all probationary and tenured teachers. The results of teacher evaluations are used for the instructional improvement of individual teachers. They are also used in making personnel decisions.

DESCRIPTION

The Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation system evaluates teacher performance in four areas: (1) instructional process, (2) classroom management, (3) interpersonal relationships, and (4) professional responsibilities. Each of these areas is divided into more specific, research-based criteria. For example, the two criteria included under classroom management are (1) organizes classroom environment to promote learning, and (2) manages student behavior in a constructive manner. A total of 19 criteria is included in the evaluation system. Descriptors that further delineate each criterion also are provided. The number of criteria and descriptors for each area is as follows: (1) instructional process (10 criteria,

55 descriptors); (2) classroom management (2 criteria, 14 descriptors); (3) interpersonal relationships (3 criteria, 19 descriptors); and (4) professional responsibilities (4 criteria, 11 descriptors). Evaluation ratings (on a four-point scale) are made only on the 19 criteria, not the 99 descriptors.

The evaluation process has three phases. During the first phase, Orientation, administrators and teachers are introduced to the system. In addition, training is recommended for administrators responsible for conducting evaluations.

The second, or Formative Phase, involves the ongoing observation and supervision of classroom teachers. In this phase, teaching strengths and weaknesses are identified and job targets that should lead to improved performance are defined. Three forms are provided to assist in the Formative Phase: a Pre-Observation Worksheet to structure the observation, a Formative Observation Form for recording information about the teaching process, and a Job Target Sheet to set goals and procedures for improving teachers' performance. Additional observations are conducted to monitor teachers' attainment of the job targets. The developers recommend that both scheduled and unscheduled observations be conducted and that pre- and post-observation conferences be held.

During the final, or Summative Phase, all data pertaining to the performance of the teacher are reviewed. Performance ratings are entered on the Summative Evaluation Report for all 19 criteria. A conference is held so that the evaluator and teacher can review findings.

No formal validity or reliability studies have been conducted on the Missouri system. Several doctoral dissertations have examined various aspects of the system.

A description of the system, as well as recommended forms, is contained in a state department document, Guidelines for Perfor-

mance Based Teacher Evaluation in Missouri. This document may be obtained from ERIC (Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 785) or from the Department of Education.

USE

Ideally, the process should occur over the course of a school year in order to allow feedback from the Formative Phase to influence the teacher's skills. The Summative Phase should be completed for probationary teachers each year and for tenured teachers at least every three years.

Scoring and reporting of the evaluation findings are the responsibility of the evaluator. Computer assistance can be used but is not necessary.

The state department recommends that all administrators receive training annually. Training should focus on the evaluation process and procedures, as well as the roles of the teacher and evaluator.

RESULTS

The results of an individual teacher evaluation are presented in the Summative Evaluation Report. The report summarizes the teacher's performance on each of the 19 criteria, along with additional comments. Evaluation ratings are reported for individual teachers only. The results are used in planning instructional improvement activities and in making personnel decisions.

COSTS

A copy of the guidelines can be obtained from the Department of Education at no cost. The guidelines are available from ERIC for $3.60 plus postage. The costs of implementing the system (i.e., Orientation, Formative, and Summative phases) vary depending on the size of the district.

COMMENTS

The state recently completed superintendent and principal evaluation systems. These systems are described in Section IV of this directory.

Guidelines for the evaluation of librarians and counselors are available as a supplement to the guidelines for teacher evaluation.

## THE TOLEDO PLAN - INTERN, INTERVENTION, EVALUATION

DEVELOPER

Toledo Public Schools
Toledo Federation of Teachers

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Thomas D. Bollin
Assistant Superintendent, Personnel
Toledo Public Schools
Manhattan and Elm Streets
Toledo, OH 43608
419-729-8234

Dal Lawrence, President
Toledo Federation of Teachers
320 W. Woodruff
Toledo, OH 43624
419-243-8527

OVERVIEW

The Toledo Plan was initiated in 1981 in order to provide a formula for the professional development of beginning teachers, as well as experienced teachers who are severely deficient in performance. Teacher performance is assessed, performance goals are established for needed improvements, and reassessment occurs after a growth period to check for attainment of the performance goals. Peer review and assistance are integral parts of the process. Evaluation results are used to make future employment decisions. The Toledo Plan is a cooperative effort of the Toledo Public Schools and the Toledo Federation of Teachers.

DESCRIPTION

Teacher performance is assessed in the areas of teaching procedures, classroom management, knowledge of subject - academic preparation, and personal characteristics and professional responsibility. Three of the four areas are divided into more specific criteria. For example, classroom management includes (1) effective classroom facilitation and control, (2) effective interaction with pupils, (3) efficient classroom routine, (4) appropriate interaction with pupils, and (5) fairness and impartiality in dealing with students. Twenty-three

criteria are included in the evaluation. Each of the criteria is defined in a glossary to assist evaluators in making their ratings. The total number of criteria and descriptors is as follows: (1) teaching procedures (10 criteria, 38 descriptors); (2) classroom management (5 criteria, 14 descriptors); (3) knowledge of subject - academic preparation (overall rating only, 2 descriptors); and (4) personal characteristics and professional responsibility (7 criteria, 7 descriptors). Ratings on the 23 criteria are made at the conclusion of the evaluation process on a three-point scale (i.e., outstanding, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory).

Evaluation procedures vary somewhat depending on the teacher's employment status (i.e., intern, probationary, or tenured). In general, the process involves five steps: (1) preliminary conference in which the process is described to the teacher, (2) goal-setting observation (a minimum of 20 uninterrupted minutes) in which the teacher's performance is observed and assessed, (3) goal-setting conference in which specific goals for the teacher's performance are established, (4) growth period which allows the teacher time to follow through on performance goals, and (5) summary evaluation and conference in which the Summary Evaluation Form is completed and discussed. Steps 2-5 repeat several times during the school year depending on the teacher's employment status. The evaluation process is completed by a consulting teacher for intern teachers and by the principal or central office staff for all other teachers. Non-intern teachers may request a peer evaluation.

The Toledo Plan is described in a booklet entitled The Toledo Plan - Intern, Intervention, Evaluation. The booklet contains all forms and instructions. Although the district plans to conduct studies of validity and/or reliability of the system, no studies have been conducted to date.

The Toledo Plan is ideally used over the course of the entire school year. Forms, USE

procedures, and timelines are provided for using the system. The forms are completed by the evaluator; no machine scoring is required.

RESULTS

Individual teacher evaluations are reported on the Summative Evaluation Form. The form presents ratings on each of the 23 criteria. Supporting documents (e.g., performance goal documentation) can be attached to the form. The results provide feedback to teachers on their performance and also assist administrators in making employment decisions.

COSTS

A copy of the booklet is available from the district free of charge. Costs for implementing the teacher evaluation system (e.g., training, conducting evaluations, and providing consultations) vary depending on the size of the district.

## NTE PROGRAMS

Educational Testing Service

**DEVELOPER**

NTE Programs
Educational Testing Service
CN 6051
Princeton, NJ 08541-6051
609-921-9000

**CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION**

**OVERVIEW**

The NTE tests, commonly known as the National Teacher Examinations, were developed in 1940 to provide objective assessments of the academic achievement of individuals who are completing or have already completed teacher education programs. The tests have undergone periodic revisions to reflect changing content and teaching practices. A 15-member NTE Policy Council is responsible for setting all program policies involving the development, administration, and use of the NTE. The members represent state departments of education and school districts, teacher training institutions, and classroom teachers. The tests are used to determine teachers' knowledge and skills, as well as for certification purposes.

**DESCRIPTION**

The NTE Programs include the Core Battery Tests and 28 Specialty Area Tests. The former include three tests: Communication Skills, General Knowledge, and Professional Knowledge. The Communication Skills Test measures listening, reading, and writing skills. The General Knowledge Test includes questions on literature and fine arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The Professional Knowledge Test includes questions related to the social and cultural forces that influence curriculum and teaching, as well as questions dealing with general principles of learning and instruction. The Specialty Area Tests cover a wide range of areas (e.g., art education, English language and literature, industrial arts education, Spanish) and measure understanding of the content and methods applicable to the separate subject areas.

Numerous validity and reliability studies have been conducted on the NTE. The validity studies have generated much controversy, especially studies that attempt to correlate NTE scores with later success in the classroom. Reliability estimates are acceptable.

There are a variety of materials and guides available from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). These include a supervisor's manual, technical handbook, bulletin of information for candidates, guidelines for using the NTE, a descriptive booklet, test booklets, and machine-scored answer sheets.

USE

There are six national administrations of the NTE, three for the Core Battery Tests, and three for the Specialty Area Tests, at testing centers across the country. Individuals are required to pre-register by mail. The Core Battery Tests require a full day to complete (7:45 a.m. to 4:50 p.m.), while the Specialty Area Tests require a half day (8:30 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.). Tests are machine-scored by ETS, and results returned approximately six weeks later.

RESULTS

NTE results are reported to the individual completing the test. This individual can request that additional score reports be sent to institutions or agencies. A single overall scaled score is reported for each test. In addition, the score report contains the number and percentage of items answered correctly, incorrectly, and omitted by subtest (when applicable). As noted above, the NTE scores provide a profile of teachers' knowledge and skills. These profiles can be used along with other information to determine teacher competency and certification.

COSTS

One Core Battery Test ($28.00); two Core Battery Tests (on same test date) ($38.00); three Core Battery Tests (on same test date) ($48.00); Specialty Area Test ($35.00).

## IV. ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE

This section of the directory contains descriptions of instruments and processes for evaluating school principals and central office administrators. Much less research and development work has been done in this area than in the student and teacher assessment areas, but many new efforts are being mounted.

Some of the instruments and processes described are designed to assess the performance of both building-level and central office administrators; others are for the assessment of administrators at only one level. The instruments and processes also vary with respect to the individuals and groups involved in the assessment. In some cases, information used for evaluation purposes is gathered from several sources (e.g., immediate supervisor(s), teachers, parents). In others, only the administrator's supervisor(s) is involved.

The following instruments and processes are included in the directory:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| • The Profile for Assessment of Leaders (PAL) | IV-3 |
| • Missouri Performance Based Superintendent and Principal Evaluations | IV-6 |
| • The Profile of a School (POS) | IV-10 |
| • Administrator Management-by-Objectives Appraisal System (AMOAS) | IV-14 |
| • The Evaluation of Principals as Instructional Leaders | IV-16 |
| • The Assessment Center Project and Springfield Development Program | IV-19 |


On the following page is a chart that lists, for each instrument or process described, the administrators being assessed (i.e., central office administrators, superintendent only, principals) and the individuals and groups involved in the assessment.

In Section V of this directory are a number of instruments and processes that also include the collection of data on specific measures of administrative behavior (e.g., instructional leadership, structured staff development).

| Instrument/Process | Who Is Assessed | Who Assesses |
|---|---|---|
| PAL | Central Office Administrators<br>Principals | Supervisor(s)<br>Administrator Him/Herself<br>Teachers<br>Students<br>Parents |
| Missouri | Superintendents<br>Principals | Supervisor(s) |
| POS | Central Office Administrators<br>Principals | School Board<br>Central Office and School Staffs<br>Students<br>Parents |
| AMOAS | Central Office Administrators<br>Principals | Supervisor(s) |
| Evaluation of Principals | Principals | Supervisor(s)<br>School Staff<br>Students<br>Parents |
| Assessment Center | Principals | Assessment Center Assessors |

## THE PROFILE FOR ASSESSMENT OF LEADERS

DEVELOPER

Null A. Tucker
SuEllen Bray

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Null A. Tucker
Director of Research and Evaluation
DeKalb County School System
955 North Indian Creek Drive
Clarkston, GA 30021
404-292-6613

OVERVIEW

The Profile for Assessment of Leaders (PAL), developed by the DeKalb County School System, provides profiles of administrator performance on eight general competencies. The profiles are derived from different data collected from the administrator's supervisor, the administrator him/herself, teachers, parents, and students. Used with both building-level and central office administrators, PAL is part of a comprehensive staff development program in the DeKalb schools. It was field tested and revised in 1982 and 1983, and has been in use throughout the county since then.

DESCRIPTION

The PAL materials include questionnaires to be completed by teachers, students, parents, the administrator him/herself, and his or her supervisor. Respondents indicate whether specific administrator behaviors have been "observed" or "not observed." These behaviors were selected by panels of experts from over 10,000 administrator behaviors identified through an exhaustive literature review.

Administrators are evaluated in eight general competencies: (1) relating to other people, (2) communicating effectively, (3) making decisions, (4) planning and organizing, (5) supervising and evaluating, (6) improving professionally and providing staff opportunity, (7) protecting time on task for teachers and students, and (8) holding high expectations of students and teachers. (This last competency is

included in an experimental 1986-87 version of the questionnaires.)

Each competency is divided into indicators which, in turn, are subdivided into descriptors of behaviors. For example, Competency I (relating to others) is divided into four indicators: (1) promoting positive relationships, (2) respecting opinions of others, (3) managing conflicts, and (4) maintaining integrity. The first indicator -- promoting positive relationships -- is broken down into four descriptors: (1) giving recognition and praise to staff, colleagues, students, and community members; (2) demonstrating courtesy to others; (3) demonstrating relevant personal knowledge and interest in staff and other associates; and (4) demonstrating impartiality.

The number of indicators and descriptors for each competency is as follows: (1) relating to others (4 indicators, 15 descriptors); (2) communicating (3 indicators, 12 descriptors); (3) making decisions (2 indicators, 8 descriptors); (4) planning and organizing (4 indicators, 19 descriptors); (5) supervising and evaluating (4 indicators, 19 descriptors); (6) professional development (2 indicators, 7 descriptors); (7) time on task (2 indicators, 8 descriptors); and (8) high expectations (2 indicators, 10 descriptors).

Results from PAL have been correlated with other indicators of school performance, and the positive relationships attest to PAL's validity. No reliability data are reported.

About one-half hour is required to complete each questionnaire. Results can be computed either by hand or by machine.

USE

Results are reported as a profile of administrator behavior, as perceived by each group filling out the questionnaire, including the administrator him/herself. Results are displayed by competency, indicator, and descriptor. The percentage of each group reporting the behavior as "observed" is

RESULTS

Indicated. Comparisons can be made of the discrepancy between self-reports and those of either superiors or subordinates.

Results are used diagnostically to define and plan the professional development needs of the county's administrators.

COSTS

An information packet from the district costs $5.00. Instruments in the packet can be duplicated at local expense. No estimates are available for staff time to implement the process.

## MISSOURI PERFORMANCE BASED SUPERINTENDENT AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATIONS

---

DEVELOPER

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Turner Tyson, Director
Teacher Education and Certification
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314-751-3847

OVERVIEW

The Excellence in Education Act of 1985 requires each school district in Missouri to develop and use a performance based evaluation process for all administrators. In response, the state's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in conjunction with an advisory committee, developed guidelines for a performance based evaluation process for superintendents and principals. The results of this process are used in improving the educational programs of districts and schools through the professional development of administrators, as well as in making personnel decisions.

DESCRIPTION

NOTE: The Missouri superintendent and principal evaluation systems are quite similar. Only the superintendent system is described below.

The Missouri Performance Based Superintendent Evaluation system assesses the performance of superintendents in four areas: (1) educational leadership, (2) district management, (3) professional relationships, and (4) professional responsibilities. Each area is divided into more specific criteria. Examples of criteria included in the educational leadership area are (1) provides direction for the district, (2) provides for organization of instruction throughout the district, and (3) provides for implementation of performance evalua-

tion strategies for all personnel. Descriptors for each criterion are also provided. The number of criteria and descriptors for each area is as follows: (1) educational leadership (8 criteria, 24 descriptors); (2) district management (10 criteria, 38 descriptors); (3) professional relationships (3 criteria, 14 descriptors); and (4) professional responsibilities (3 criteria, 10 descriptors). A Performance Expectation Level, representing the level of performance expected of the effective superintendent, is indicated for each of the 24 criteria. Superintendents are rated by the local school board as to whether or not they are performing at that level.

The evaluation process includes three phases: (1) Preparatory Phase, (2) Formative Phase, and (3) Summative Phase. In each phase, there are actions related to the performance criteria, as well as to the accomplishment of district goals.

In the Preparatory Phase, board of education members and the superintendent cooperatively plan the evaluation process. Specifically, they review and discuss the performance criteria and discuss and agree upon district goals.

The Formative Phase includes observation and feedback. Observations generally occur as part of the regular contact between the board and superintendent, but may be scheduled specifically for evaluation purposes. The purpose of feedback during this phase is to provide the superintendent with information that will allow him/her to plan improvements, if necessary. Three forms are provided to assist in this phase: (1) a Formative Evaluation Form, on which board members are to write notes about what happened during an observation; (2) a Job Target Form, on which the board and superintendent are to outline improvement objectives and procedures for achieving them; and (3) a District Goal Statement Form, on which the board and superintendent are to record goals and progress toward their attainment.

The Summative Phase involves a review of all data gathered and results in a Summative Evaluation Report on the superintendent's performance. The summative evaluation portion of the District Goal Statement Form is also completed during this phase.

No reliability or validity studies have been conducted on the Missouri system.

A description of the system, as well as recommended forms, is presented in a state department document, Guidelines for Performance Based Evaluation of School Superintendents. This document is available from the Department of Education.

USE

In most districts, the evaluation cycle will be completed on an annual basis. Most boards of education will find it beneficial to address performance on the criteria on a January-December basis. As for the accomplishment of district goals, it may be appropriate to agree upon goals in September and assess their accomplishment by the following July.

The state department recommends that all local board members receive training in the evaluation system.

RESULTS

Superintendent performance on the 24 criteria is summarized on the Summative Evaluation Report, along with comments from the superintendent or board. These data, as well as results summarized on the District Goal Statement Form, are used in providing direction for maintaining and improving necessary skills through professional development activities. They are also used in making personnel decisions.

COSTS

A copy of the superintendent guidelines, as well as the guidelines for evaluating principals, can be obtained from the Department of Education free of charge.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation system is described in Section III of this directory. | COMMENTS |

## THE PROFILE OF A SCHOOL

DEVELOPER

Jane G. Likert
Rensis Likert

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Raymond C. Seghers
Rensis Likert Associates
Suite 401, Wolverine Tower
3001 S. State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48108
313-769-1980

OVERVIEW

The Profile of a School (POS) is a set of questionnaires designed to assess administrator performance and school climate, with the aim of providing information for organizational improvement. The POS is appropriate for both individual schools and entire school districts. The questionnaires grew out of research conducted in a wide variety of organizational settings over the past 30 years by the Institute for Social Research of The University of Michigan. The work is based on the premise that a particularly promising way to help improve schools is to help administrators use a more effective management system. Four types of management systems have been conceptualized from the least effective, exploitative, authoritarian model (System 1) to the most effective, participative group model (System 4). Questionnaire forms are available for students, staff, the superintendent, the school board, and parents. All of these groups are asked to assess the management performance of principals and/or central office administrators.

DESCRIPTION

The POS questionnaires survey perceptions of behavior using six different forms: (1) Student Form 1 (grades 4-6) (9 items), (2) Student Form 2 (grades 7-12) (62 items), (3) Staff Form (50 items), (4) Superintendent Form (104 items), (5) School Board Form (64 items), and (6) Parent Form (44 items). Most school districts will find the new Staff Form to be the most useful, since it provides a comparative set of measures across all job classifications.

Responses to multiple questionnaire items are combined to form indices. The first group of indices is considered to be causal (i.e., they impact indirectly or directly on end-result variables such as student achievement and teacher morale). These indices include organizational climate, leader support, goal emphasis, team building, work facilitation, and technical competence. There are also intervening indices that reflect the internal state of the organization. These include openness of communication, direction of information flow, accuracy of upward information, nature of peer interactions, amount of influences, and self-motivation. The third category of indices consists of end-result variables that measure employee satisfaction.

Each item on the questionnaires is answered on a five- or eight-point scale, with questions phrased so that a low score represents System 1 and a high score, System 4.

In addition to the standardized questions, the POS questionnaires can include supplemental questions tailored to meet the specific needs of schools or districts. Other survey instruments can also be used in conjunction with the POS.

The reliability and validity of the instruments are described briefly in The Profile of a School: A Resource for Improving School Administration, available from Rensis Likert Associates (RLA). Readers are referred to a wide range of technical papers that more fully address these issues. Norms have been developed for the instruments, based on over 45,000 respondents from more than 100 school systems and 700 schools in 22 states.

USE

It takes between 30 and 45 minutes to complete the surveys. In most cases, the questionnaires are reusable, since answers are written on separate optical scanning scoring sheets. Detailed instructions to facilitate optimal administration conditions are provided. All scoring is done by RLA.

RESULTS

Computer printouts report mean scores for each item as well as the indices. An examination of any item or index permits classification of the organizational behavior of a school or school district on a spectrum ranging from the least effective to the most effective, i.e., from System 1 to System 4. In addition, it is possible to compare a school or district with other schools or districts. A large normative database is available for this purpose. Specialized breakdowns can also be ordered to adapt to individual school district requirements. For example, student scores are available by grade level or gender and teacher scores are available by grade level, subject taught, or length of service.

Results can be used in assessing the performance of principals and/or central office administrators, as well as the climate of a school or district. Information in these areas can then be used in organizational improvement.

A survey-guided development process, developed by RLA, is available to assist school districts in using the data from the POS to make improvements.

COSTS

An information packet is available from RLA. This packet includes sample surveys for students, staff, the superintendent, parents, and school board members and a copy of The Profile of a School: A Resource for Improving School Administration. The cost of the packet is $12.00. Manuals documenting the survey-guided development process are available free of charge.

Costs for implementation vary markedly depending on the size of the school or district, the number of different groups being surveyed, and the variety and complexity of the requested analyses. Estimated costs are available upon request from RLA. Costs include questionnaires, answer sheets, computerized data processing by RLA, and a report of the findings.

Costs for consultant time from the RLA staff to help districts with data

interpretation or follow-up improvement activities are available upon request.

COMMENTS

A long history of research supports the utility of the POS instruments. Two useful documents summarize that research. The first is "Evidence of the Effectiveness of System 4 in School Administration," available from RLA for $5.00. The second is a reprint of a 1980 journal article by J. G. Likert and R. Likert entitled "New Resources for Improving School Administration" (NASSP Bulletin, 64(435), 49-58), which is available at no cost.

## ADMINISTRATOR MANAGEMENT-BY-OBJECTIVES APPRAISAL SYSTEM

**DEVELOPER**

This is a generic model used in many school districts. The Muhlenberg School District in Laureldale, PA is described below as an example.

**CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION**

Raymond Bernabei
I. E. Banreb Associates
541 Woodview Drive
Longwood, FL 32779
305-862-3305

**OVERVIEW**

The Administrative Management-by-Objectives Appraisal System (AMOAS) is designed to evaluate school administrators on two broad bases: (1) a set of objectives established jointly with the administrator's immediate supervisor, and (2) daily job performance. A committee of school board members, administrators, and the superintendent develops the plan together. Performance ratings are linked to salary increases. AMOAS has been implemented in 26 school districts across the United States.

**DESCRIPTION**

AMOAS consists of a committee-developed compensation plan. The Muhlenberg plan places 50 percent of the administrator evaluation on the accomplishment of defined objectives set by the administrator and approved by his or her supervisor, and 50 percent on everyday job performance as measured through position descriptions. These descriptions are developed with input from each administrator. Each objective is weighted, and each category of the position description carries a specific rating. The combined rating from both areas determines the administrator's salary increase for the year.

The Muhlenberg materials provide guidelines for developing position descriptions and assigning values to seven categories within those descriptions. The categories include: (1) background: education, experience; (2) application of knowledge: complexity,

latitude; (3) supervisory responsibility - complexity: size of supervisory responsibility (employees), complexity; (4) contacts: nature of contacts, degree of persuasiveness required; (5) integrity of information: exposure to confidential information, requirements for safeguarding confidential information; (6) impact of errors; and (7) time requirements.

No reliability or validity information is available.

Further information about AMOAS is available from I. E. Banreb Associates.

USE

The system requires a minimum of two performance reviews a year and a final evaluation. During the review process, the supervisor must shadow or observe the administrator for at least one full day. At least one additional day is needed for analysis of observed behavior, writing of the formal evaluation, conference time to review the evaluation, and determination of the final salary increase.

Potential users are cautioned that AMOAS may take considerable time (2-4 years) to completely implement and refine.

RESULTS

The system results in a final rating of the administrator's performance, which, in turn, directly affects his or her annual salary increase.

COSTS

Since this is a generic model, specific job descriptions and sets of objectives must be developed locally. No estimates are available of costs in terms of staff time needed for local development or implementation.

## THE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS

DEVELOPER

Lawrence G. Chase
James Bellanca
Kenneth Gill
Null A. Tucker
Howard Nelson

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

James Bellanca
Illinois Renewal Institute
200 East Wood Street
Suite 250
Palatine, IL 60067
312-991-6300

OVERVIEW

The Evaluation of Principals as Instructional Leaders is a comprehensive set of training materials designed to provide, in a workshop setting, the skills needed to train superintendents in the improved evaluation and professional development of principals. The workshop materials consist of overheads, literature syntheses, and evaluation questionnaires. As part of the workshop experience, participants learn how to administer four different questionnaires for gathering data from the principal's supervisor, teachers and other staff in the school, students, and parents. The Evaluation of Principals as Instructional Leaders was completed in 1986 at the Northwest Educational Cooperative, under contract to the Illinois State Board of Education.

DESCRIPTION

Each of the four questionnaires included in the workshop materials assesses principals' instructional leadership skills along nine major competencies: (1) communicating a vision of the school's mission; (2) demonstrating knowledge of the school curriculum and the instructional program; (3) supervising the teaching process and monitoring student progress; (4) promoting a positive school climate and interpersonal relationships among students, community, and staff members; (5) demonstrating planning and organizational skills; (6) demonstrating effective communication skills; (7) demon-

strating skill in making decisions; (8) setting high expectations for students and staff; and (9) promoting personal professional improvement and providing staff with opportunities for professional improvement.

Each competency is sorted into from two to six indicators (total = 26), which are, in turn, broken out into from eight to thirty descriptors (total = 119). As an example, Competency II, with its two indicators and ten descriptors, is outlined below.

Competency II: The building administrator demonstrates knowledge of the school curriculum and the instructional program.

Indicator A: The building administrator demonstrates a working knowledge of the curriculum.
Descriptors: (1) conveys to the staff a knowledge of the curriculum content, scope, and sequencing in all subjects and across grade levels; (2) conveys to the staff a knowledge of those materials that best support the curriculum; (3) gives priority to and takes responsibility for decisions about implementing the curriculum; and (4) monitors the school's overall instructional program to insure that student objectives are consistent with the school curriculum.

Indicator B: The building administrator demonstrates knowledge of instructional methods, techniques, and materials necessary to implement the school curriculum.
Descriptors: (1) demonstrates sufficient knowledge of those instructional methods that produce the greatest student growth; (2) demonstrates a knowledge of teacher behaviors that cause students to learn; (3) works with teachers to plan and/or modify instruction based on student needs; (4) is resourceful in identifying instructional materials that can be used by the teacher for specific students or specific units; (5) uses knowledge of curriculum to help place students in appropriate groups, levels, grades, and/or courses; and (6) helps teachers, students, and parents see how the curriculum relates to goal achievement and ultimately to the vision of the school.

The four questionnaires are formatted differently. The superordinate form elicits responses on each of the 26 indicators in a satisfactory/not satisfactory/not applicable format. The subordinate form (designed for teachers and staff) requests judgments about each of the 119 descriptors on a four-point scale from "almost never" to "almost always." Both the parent and student forms use different language than the other forms and do not elicit judgments about all competencies, indicators, or descriptors.

No information on reliability and validity is available.

There are no guidelines mentioned for administration or scoring of the questionnaires. It is expected that workshop participants, in their training of others, will modify the materials and develop procedures as they see fit.

USE

No information is offered regarding appropriate forms of analysis or reporting formats for the data.

Results are used to evaluate building-level administrators and to develop a professional development plan. Upon receipt of the results, the administrator and his/her superior develop a plan where specific, concrete activities are stipulated.

RESULTS

The workshop materials cost $23.00. Questionnaires can be duplicated at local expense. No estimates are available for staff time to implement the process. Additional information on how to train others in the evaluation of principals is included in a trainer's manual, which is available for $9.00.

COSTS

## THE ASSESSMENT CENTER PROJECT AND SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

NASSP Assessment Center Project

DEVELOPER

Paul W. Hersey, Director
National Assessment Project
1904 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703-860-2444 or 703-860-0200

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center Project is designed to provide comprehensive, indepth, multimethod assessments of and developmental opportunities for school administrators. The Assessment Center Project was developed in 1975 to improve the selection of elementary and secondary school principals. A long-term professional development component -- the Springfield Development Program -- was recently added to provide opportunities for practicing administrators to grow under the guidance of a mentor. Both projects are best viewed as processes that rely on the use of multiple methods for diagnosing administrative skills.

DESCRIPTION

The Assessment Center process focuses on administrative behavior in 12 broad areas: (1) problem analysis, (2) judgment, (3) organizational ability, (4) decisiveness, (5) leadership, (6) sensitivity, (7) stress tolerance, (8) oral communication, (9) written communication, (10) range of interest, (11) personal motivation, and (12) educational values.

Candidates for administrative selection, promotion, or development participate in five or six simulated activities of the principalship and a structured interview. Two of the simulations are in-basket exercises, which require the participant to play the role of a newly appointed administrator and respond to a package of memos, mail, telephone calls, etc. A fact-finding

simulation requires participants to seek out information dealing with a typical school problem and to make an oral presentation. Two leaderless group discussions involve the analysis and discussion of problems in a typical school district.

Each candidate is observed by a group of trained assessors while completing the assessment exercises. In a typical center, a team of six or more assessors observes 12 participants and evaluates the participants' behavior as it relates to the 12 dimensions listed above.

The assessor team discusses each candidate's observed behaviors and completes consensus ratings for each of the skill dimensions. A comprehensive written assessment report is prepared describing the skill strengths, areas of needed improvement and development, and an overall placement recommendation. Each participant is also given extensive verbal feedback on his/her performance in each of the dimensions.

Candidates for new administrative positions typically participate in the Assessment Center process, while "graduates" of that process or practicing administrators with no more than five years of experience participate in the Springfield program. Once diagnostic assessment through a variety of activities (e.g., simulation exercises, fact-finding exercises, interviews) is complete, Springfield participants are assigned to specially trained mentors who meet periodically with the administrator, make recommendations for improvement, and review progress after about three months. In many cases, this process continues for more than a year.

Internal, criterion-related, and content validity of the Assessment Center process was determined through a three-year study conducted by researchers from Michigan State University. Results are available from the developer and indicate a high level of validity in each area. No reliability information is available.

A variety of descriptive materials are available from the developer for potential participants and potential developers of an Assessment Center site.

Participation in the Assessment Center process requires two eight-hour days. USE

Participants receive summary feedback on their performance in the assessment activities both orally and in written form. Districts use these results for the selection, promotion, or development of administrators. RESULTS

Descriptive materials are available at a cost ranging from $.75 to $7.00. The cost of participating in the Assessment Center process is $50 per participant, which covers materials. For a district, university, or other nonprofit educational organization to become affiliated with the Assessment Center and receive approval as an accredited site, costs include a one-time affiliation fee ($5,000); training of assessors ($250 per assessor); travel, lodging, and meals for the training; and an honorarium ($500) to an NASSP-approved monitor who insures fidelity to the Assessment Center process. COSTS

# V. SCHOOL CLIMATE

This section of the directory contains descriptions of instruments and processes designed to assess important conditions of classrooms and schools. Some instruments and processes focus on variables that have grown out of recent research on effective classrooms (e.g., time on task, frequent monitoring of student progress) and effective schools (e.g., high expectations, clear mission). Others assess variables typically associated with the term "school climate" (e.g., communication, influence, morale, commitment). The instruments and processes also vary in terms of the types of individuals from whom data are gathered (e.g., students, teachers, parents) and the grade level(s) at which data collection is appropriate.

The following instruments and processes are included in the directory:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| • Santa Clara School Effectiveness Program Surveys | V-3 |
| • Illinois Quality Schools Index (IQSI) | V-6 |
| • Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire | V-10 |
| • School Self-Assessment Instruments | V-13 |
| • Effective School Battery (ESB) | V-16 |
| • Classroom Environment Scale (CES) | V-19 |
| • School Assessment Survey (SAS) | V-23 |
| • Organizational Climate Survey (OCS) | V-26 |
| • School Climate Improvement (SCI) | V-29 |
| • Quality of School Life (QSL) | V-33 |
| • Learning Environment Inventory/My Class Inventory (LEI/MCI) | V-36 |
| • Middle Grades Assessment Program (MGAP) | V-39 |


The Santa Clara, IQSI, Connecticut, and School Self-Assessment instruments and processes assess, for the most part, research-based characteristics of effective schools and classrooms. The remaining entries deal primarily with the more typical climate variables. A chart on the following page lists, for each instrument or process, the grade level(s) and type(s) of individuals that are the focus of data collection.

| Instrument/Process | Level(s) | Respondent(s) |
|---|---|---|
| Santa Clara | Elementary<br>Middle | Students<br>Teachers<br>Parents |
| IQSI | Elementary<br>Secondary | Students<br>Staff<br>Parents<br>Others |
| Connecticut | Elementary<br>Middle | Staff |
| School Self-Assessment | Elementary<br>Secondary | Students<br>Staff<br>Parents |
| ESB | Secondary | Students<br>Teachers |
| CES | Secondary | Students<br>Teachers |
| SAS | Elementary<br>Secondary | Teachers |
| OCS | Elementary<br>Secondary | All Adults<br>in a School |
| SCI | Elementary<br>Secondary | Students<br>Staff<br>Parents |
| QSL | Elementary<br>Secondary | Students |
| LEI/MCI | Elementary<br>Secondary | Students |
| MGAP | Middle | Students<br>Staff<br>Parents |

## SANTA CLARA SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM SURVEYS

DEVELOPER

Santa Clara County Office of Education

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Andrea R. Lichter, Coordinator
School Effectiveness Program
Santa Clara County Office of Education
100 Skyport Drive, MC 237
San Jose, CA 96115
408-947-6899

OVERVIEW

The Santa Clara County surveys, completed in 1983-84, were developed over a three-year period by the County Office of Education for use in elementary schools participating in its School Effectiveness Program. The research base included the areas of school and teacher effectiveness, delinquency studies, and educational productivity. There are three surveys (teacher, student, parent), each addressing variables that research has shown contribute to instructional effectiveness. The teacher and parent surveys are designed for individuals representing kindergarten through grade 6; the student survey is for students in grades 4-8, but all normed data are for elementary schools only. Survey data can serve as a basis for planning school improvement activities.

DESCRIPTION

The three surveys include 327 items that measure 14 variables associated with instructional effectiveness. The student survey includes 140 items; the teacher survey, 126; and the parent survey, 61.

The 14 variables are grouped into three basic areas. The first area includes three variables that organize curriculum and instruction: (1) opportunity to learn, (2) tightly coupled curriculum, and (3) effective instruction. The second area includes four variables that support curriculum and instruction: (1) clear academic focus and mission, (2) instructional leadership, (3) monitoring of student progress, and (4) structured staff development. In the third

area are seven variables that promote an effective school climate: (1) high expectations, (2) safe and orderly environment, (3) widespread student rewards and recognition, (4) home-school cooperation and support, (5) opportunities for meaningful student involvement, (6) sense of community, and (7) collaborative organizational practices.

From three to nine indicators define each of the 14 variables. All three surveys address all 14 variables, but not all indicators.

Response options depend upon the particular item. Respondents are asked to express (1) their agreement or disagreement with each item on a four- or five-point scale, (2) the frequency of occurrence on a five-point scale, or (3) "yes" or "no." In other cases, a numeric value is requested (e.g., "How many years have you been at this school?").

Extensive data presented in a technical manual available from the developer attest to the reliability and validity of the surveys. Norms have been developed based on 14 California schools identified as effective.

Survey data are to be collected in a one-week period. The student survey is administered by classroom teachers in two 45-minute sessions held on two different days. Teacher surveys, which require 45-55 minutes to complete, can be filled out at a time and place agreed to by teachers and the principal. Parent surveys, which take 40-50 minutes to complete, can be administered as the school sees fit.

USE

Machine scoring of surveys is done by the County Office of Education. Follow-up assistance to schools in action planning (i.e., prioritizing needs, setting goals, and formulating and implementing school plans) is available.

RESULTS

Survey results are presented as part of a school's Basic School Profile, which also includes information on student outcomes that is obtained from school records. Survey results are presented in three ways. First, the results for each group are reported separately, and the means on each indicator are compared to those of schools identified as effective. Second, the results of each group are compared on each indicator included on all three surveys. Third, results from specific student subgroups are reported for each indicator and compared to results from the same subgroup in effective schools. Student data are reported for six subgroups: (1) achievement level, (2) sex, (3) grade level, (4) ethnicity, (5) language dominance, and (6) parent education level. This information can be helpful to a school trying to assess whether or not certain student subgroups are having difficulties in a particular area.

The Basic School Profile can be used as the basis for planning school improvement activities. It can also provide information related to many of the criteria used to review state and federally funded programs in schools.

COSTS

An Information Packet, which includes sample surveys, is available from the County Office of Education at no charge. A technical manual is available for review.

The cost of the Basic School Profile ranges from $550 to $750.

COMMENTS

Only sample questions from the three surveys were reviewed. The County Office of Education will not release the complete surveys for review.

## ILLINOIS QUALITY SCHOOLS INDEX

Illinois State Board of Education

DEVELOPER

Larry Werner
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
217-782-2826

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Illinois Quality Schools Index (IQSI), completed in 1984, is a process for reviewing the quality of a school building or district as a basis for planning improvements. The process has been used in Illinois districts to measure and make improvement recommendations related to eight characteristics of effective schools, as identified in the research literature. The process can involve administrators, teachers, and/or students at both the elementary and secondary levels; board members, parents, community members, and other school staff can also be included.

DESCRIPTION

The IQSI process consists of five steps. Step 1, Organizing the Process, is aimed at establishing a structure for coordinating the process in the building or district. Four activities need to be accomplished in this step: (1) organize the IQSI committee, (2) develop a calendar of events that includes three meeting dates and sufficient time between meetings for data processing, (3) plan the first meeting, and (4) publicize the process to staff and community members.

Step 2, Gathering Information, is conducted at the first meeting of the IQSI committee. After the IQSI coordinator explains the process, the role and responsibilities of the committee, and the data-collection instruments (described later in this section), committee members select the school characteristics to be studied and complete the instruments that focus on these characteristics. Following this

meeting, the coordinator tabulates responses to the instruments. (The State Board of Education provides data processing services for districts in Illinois.)

Step 3, Analyzing Results, takes place at the second committee meeting. Data are reviewed and discussed. Discussion is important in this step to ensure that the results actually reflect the committee's opinion. Committee members then rate priority items on which to focus further attention. Results are tabulated prior to the next meeting.

Step 4, Reporting Results, occurs at the third and final meeting of the committee. Committee members discuss and select the final priorities. Potential strategies for addressing the priorities and a plan for informing the community of results are also considered.

Step 5, Developing and Implementing Strategies, is the responsibility of those individuals charged with the task of school improvement in the school or district.

There are eight IQSI instruments, one for each of eight characteristics of effective schools: (1) leadership, (2) mission, (3) expectations, (4) time on task, (5) monitoring, (6) basic skills, (7) climate, and (8) parent/community participation. From 15 to 30 indicators define each characteristic. There are 158 indicators in all. The committee may select any or all of the instruments, add indicators, or change words or phrases suggested by group consensus.

At the first committee meeting, members are arranged in groups according to the constituency they represent (e.g., board members, teachers). Within each group, every other person is told to rate the extent to which the school or district is demonstrating each indicator (the "what is" scale). Ratings are made on a scale from "none" (1) to "very great" (6), with "undecided" (0) as another option. Others in the group are told to rate, on the same six-point scale,

the importance of each indicator to quality schooling (the "what should be" scale).

No reliability or validity studies have been done on the IQSI instruments.

The IQSI Manual, available from the State Board of Education and from ERIC (Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 493), contains a description of the process and copies of the instruments. Appendices present suggested strategies for committee selection, guidelines for manually computing results, data report forms, sample press releases, materials for meetings, and an outline for plans to address indicators.

USE

The IQSI process is expected to be carried out over a two- to six-week period. Prior to initiating the process, administrators need to make decisions on certain key matters, such as level of participation (e.g., grade, district); desired outcome (e.g., program development, communication); who will serve as coordinator (e.g., internal staff member, outside consultant); and who will serve as committee members (e.g., board members, administrators, teachers, students, parents).

The State Board of Education suggests that a manageable approach to the process treats no more than five characteristics at a time and involves representation across all grade levels within a single attendance area. The recommended size of the committee is 40-45 people to allow for at least 20 respondents to the "what is" and "what should be" scales of the instruments.

Data processing services are provided by the State Board of Education for districts in Illinois. Instructions for manual scoring are included in the IQSI Manual.

RESULTS

Three types of results are presented to the IQSI committee: (1) the average ratings of each indicator on the "what is" and "what should be" scales; (2) the average differences on the "what is" and "what should be"

scales, for each indicator; and (3) a list of the 25-30 indicators with the greatest difference between ratings on the two scales. Committee members review all results, then rate the 25-30 indicators on a scale of importance ranging from "none" (0) to "very great" (5). The indicators with the highest ratings become the focus for school improvement efforts that may involve changes in such areas as staff development, board policy, instructional methods, or teaching conditions.

COSTS

A copy of the IQSI Manual is provided by the State Board of Education to school personnel at no cost. The manual is available from ERIC for $5.40 plus postage. The cost of implementing the IQSI process, including administration of the instruments, cannot be estimated, but it should be minimal.

## CONNECTICUT SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE

DEVELOPER

Connecticut Department of Education

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Joan Shoemaker
William Gauthier
Connecticut Department of Education
P. O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145
203-566-5750 (Shoemaker)
203-566-5079 (Gauthier)

OVERVIEW

The Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire, completed in 1981, were developed by the Connecticut Department of Education for use in its School Effectiveness Project. Both instruments are designed to collect information from the entire instructional staff of elementary and middle schools, including principals and other school-level administrators, classroom teachers, resource teachers, and special area teachers. Both instruments assess these individuals' perceptions of the extent to which research-based characteristics of effectiveness exist in the school and its classrooms. The information provided can be used in planning and implementing school improvement activities.

DESCRIPTION

The Interview is a structured interview of 67 items, focusing on seven characteristics of effective schools: (1) safe and orderly environment (5 items), (2) clear school mission (11 items), (3) instructional leadership (14 items), (4) high expectations (10 items), (5) opportunity to learn and student time on task (9 items), (6) frequent monitoring of student progress (8 items), and (7) home-school relations (10 items). Each item includes a five-point descriptive continuum with phrases at each point that represent the range of possible responses for that item. Interviewers read each item, listen for key elements in the interviewee's response, and then code the

response at one of the five points along the continuum. Three open-ended questions are included at the end of the interview that ask for the interviewee's perceptions of school strengths and weaknesses and his/her suggestions for improvement.

The Questionnaire is a 100-item instrument that parallels the Interview in its assessment of seven research-based effectiveness characteristics. The respondent is directed to respond to each item along a five-point scale: strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree.

Evidence of the reliability and validity of both instruments is provided in the Handbook for Use, which is available from the Department of Education.

In order to ensure reliability among interviewers, training in the use of the Interview is recommended. Some information on conducting training is provided in the Handbook for Use. The Interview is designed to be administered in approximately one hour.

USE

The Questionnaire is designed for large-group administration. There is no time limit. Most respondents will complete the Questionnaire in 35-45 minutes.

There is evidence that similar data profiles are generated from the Interview and the Questionnaire. It is, therefore, possible to consider the use of only one instrument. However, use of each instrument has distinct advantages. With the Interview, there are the benefits of staff awareness and participation. With the Questionnaire, a second administration to measure changes in perceptions can be easily implemented.

Results can be machine- or hand-scored by a school system. Both the Interview and Questionnaire are designed for use with standard computer coding forms.

RESULTS

Two major information profiles can be developed from either Interview or Questionnaire data: (1) the Summary Profile and (2) the Integrated Item Profile. The Summary Profile shows aggregate responses across all items for each of the seven characteristics. The response frequencies for each point on the five-point scale are converted to percentages, and a bar graph is developed for each characteristic. In the Integrated Item Profile, the response frequencies for each item are presented in percentages. These profiles are only a suggested way of portraying data; individuals are encouraged to present data in a way that best meets their needs.

The Handbook for Use presents information on how data have been used in Connecticut's School Effectiveness Project. This information could be helpful to school staff in designing their own improvement activities.

COSTS

The Handbook for Use and copies of the Interview and Questionnaire that can be reproduced are provided by the Department of Education at no charge. The instruments can then be duplicated at local expense. The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

COMMENTS

Questionnaires for high school staff and students have also been developed by the Connecticut Department of Education. Reliability and validity studies are in progress.

## SCHOOL SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

DEVELOPER

University of Washington
Seattle Public Schools

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Richard L. Andrews
College of Education
M219 Miller Hall, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
206-543-1891

OVERVIEW

The School Self-Assessment Instruments grew out of the Effective Schools Project, initiated in 1982 by the Seattle Public Schools in collaboration with the University of Washington. The instruments assess indicators of school quality as defined by groups of school district representatives and university faculty members, based on research on effective schools and strategies for change. The instruments are administered to staff, students, and parents at both the elementary and secondary levels. To date, they have been used by more than 60 school districts. Results can be used for school assessment and program development.

DESCRIPTION

The School Self-Assessment Instruments assess 12 indicators of quality schools: (1) clear goals, (2) strong leadership, (3) dedicated staff, (4) high expectations, (5) frequent monitoring of student progress, (6) early identification of learning difficulties, (7) positive learning climate, (8) curriculum continuity, (9) multicultural education, (10) sex equity, (11) communication, and (12) parent/community involvement.

The complete set of instruments includes six questionnaires. The Staff Assessment Questionnaire consists of 94 items measuring nine quality indicators (all indicators except clear goals, communication, and parent/community involvement). The School Goals Questionnaire, administered to both staff and parents, includes 18 goal statements from which respondents must choose

five statements that represent what their school's goals are and should be and then rank their choices in order of importance. The School Assessment Questionnaire: Primary Level is an 11-item picture identification instrument that measures positive learning climate. The School Assessment Questionnaire: Intermediate Level includes 24 items that measure positive learning climate, multicultural education, and sex equity. The School Assessment Questionnaire: Secondary Level is a 52-item instrument that assesses the same three indicators as the intermediate level questionnaire. The Parent Questionnaire includes 32 items measuring four indicators (positive learning climate, early identification of learning difficulties, communication, and parent/community involvement) and 11 items dealing with desired extent of involvement.

Response options vary depending upon the particular item. For most items, respondents are asked to express their agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree.

Data included in a technical manual available from the University of Washington provide evidence of the reliability and validity of the instruments.

A detailed data collection procedures manual is available to assist school personnel in the administration of the instruments.

USE

Staff and student questionnaires are administered in groups. Parent questionnaires are mailed or sent home with students. Time for completion of the questionnaires ranges from 15 minutes for the primary level questionnaire to 50 minutes for the staff questionnaire.

School districts, subgroups of schools (e.g., elementary schools), or individual schools may use the School Self-Assessment Instruments.

Scoring of the questionnaires is done by the School Self-Assessment Service at the University of Washington.

RESULTS

Mean scores for each indicator are presented in a School Profile Book by respondent group, by school, and, if data are available, by school level (elementary, middle, high) and/or district. Item response distributions are also reported.

In addition to presenting questionnaire results, the School Profile Book includes a review of the literature related to each indicator of quality and a discussion of the use of questionnaire data in developing a building-based effective school plan.

COSTS

A specimen kit that includes the technical manual, the data collection procedures manual (including the questionnaires), and a sample School Profile Book is available for $25.00.

The cost of the scoring and reporting services provided by the School Self-Assessment Service is $150.00 per school plus $.50 per respondent. Included in this cost are master copies of the staff, intermediate level, and secondary level questionnaires and appropriate numbers of the goals, primary level, and parent questionnaires.

COMMENTS

For additional information, individuals are encouraged to consult the following:

Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. P. (in press). Principal leadership and student achievement. Educational Leadership.

## EFFECTIVE SCHOOL BATTERY

Gary D. Gottfredson
Johns Hopkins University

DEVELOPER

Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
P. O. Box 998
Odessa, FL 33556
800-331-TEST

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Effective School Battery (ESB), completed in 1984, is the result of five years of research on school climate at the Center for Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University. The ESB measures the climate of a secondary school, as perceived by teachers and students, as well as the characteristics of each group. The information gathered can be helpful to board members, administrators, and teachers.

DESCRIPTION

The ESB includes a student questionnaire and a teacher questionnaire. Students and teachers answer questions about themselves and their school using multiple-choice, agree-disagree, or true/false formats. Responses to each questionnaire are analyzed to provide two kinds of information: (1) information on the perceptions that each group has of the school's climate, and (2) information on the characteristics of that group.

Six climate measures are assessed in the student questionnaire: (1) safety, (2) respect for students, (3) planning and action, (4) fairness, (5) clarity, and (6) student influence. Twelve student characteristics are tapped: (1) parental education, (2) positive peer associations, (3) educational expectation, (4) social integration, (5) attachment to school, (6) belief in rules, (7) interpersonal competency, (8) involvement, (9) positive self-concept, (10) school effort, (11) avoidance of punishment, and (12) school rewards.

The teacher questionnaire asks for information related to nine measures of school climate: (1) safety, (2) staff morale, (3) planning and action, (4) smooth administration, (5) resources for instruction, (6) school race relations, (7) involvement of parents and community, (8) student influence, and (9) use of grades as a sanction. The seven teacher characteristics assessed are (1) pro-integration attitude, (2) job satisfaction, (3) interaction with students, (4) personal security, (5) classroom orderliness, (6) professional development, and (7) nonauthoritarian attitude.

Extensive evidence of the reliability and validity of all measures included in the ESB is presented in a user's manual available from the publisher. Norms have been developed for the battery, based on samples of teachers and students in primarily urban districts with large minority populations.

In addition to the two eight-page questionnaires with answer sheets and the user's manual, the ESB includes a coordinator's manual and survey administrator's instructions.

USE

Administration of the ESB to all students and teachers in a school is recommended, but administering to a carefully drawn sample can also produce dependable results. Administration of either the student or the teacher inventory is also an alternative.

The student inventory can be completed by nearly all students in 50 minutes. It is recommended that the inventory be administered to groups of 25-35 persons, although large-group administration is possible. Administration of the teacher inventory is most efficiently done at a staff meeting. The recommended time for administration of either inventory is late April or early May.

Completed answer sheets, all anonymous, must be sent to a scoring service for optical scanning and the preparation of school profiles. Special scoring services

(e.g., the calculation of results for particular subgroups) are also available.

RESULTS

Each school that uses the entire ESB (i.e., collects data from both teachers and students) receives a report with four profile sheets. Two profile sheets show the averaged scores for the school's climate, one based on student reports and the other on teacher reports. The other two profile sheets describe the student and teacher populations. On each profile sheet, scores are reported in percentile ranks and graphically. Examples of ESB profiles and a discussion of how they might be interpreted are presented in the user's manual. Two optional reports are available. The first, the disaggregated report, provides analyses of selected subpopulations. The second, the district-wide summary report, provides district totals and comparisons across schools.

ESB results can be used in setting priorities and making plans in a school, in opening up communication in a school, in evaluating school programs, in providing ongoing indicators of organizational health, and in system-wide planning and assessment.

COSTS

Introductory Kit (includes user's manual, coordinator's manual, survey administrator's instructions, one each of the student and teacher survey booklets and answer sheets) ($20.00); extra user's manual ($15.00); coordinator's manual ($2.50); survey administrator's instructions (pkg/10) ($3.50); student survey booklet - reusable (pkg/50) ($37.50); teacher survey booklet - reusable (pkg/25) ($18.75); student answer sheets (pkg/50) ($12.50); teacher answer sheets (pkg/25) ($6.25). Scoring: There are two costs: (1) scanning of answer sheets ($.50 per answer sheet); and (2) preparation of a standard school report ($50.00 per school), a disaggregated report ($60.00 per school), and a district-wide summary report ($30.00 per report).

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Rudolf H. Moos
Stanford University

Edison J. Trickett
University of Maryland

DEVELOPER

Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306
415-857-1444

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Classroom Environment Scale (CES) is a questionnare that assesses the social climate of junior high and high school classrooms. It is completed by students and teachers and focuses on teacher-student and student-student relationships, as well as on the organizational structure of the classroom. Development of the CES was part of a larger program of research on organizational environments conducted at the Social Ecology Laboratory of Stanford University in the early 1970s.

DESCRIPTION

The CES is a 90-item questionnaire of nine social climate subscales (ten items in each subscale). The questions are presented in a true/false format. The nine CES subscales tap three underlying domains, or sets of dimensions: (1) the relationship dimensions, (2) the personal growth or goal orientation dimensions, and (3) the system maintenance and change dimensions. The relationship dimensions are measured by the involvement, affiliation, and teacher support subscales. The personal growth or goal orientation dimensions are measured by the task orientation and competition subscales. The system maintenance and change dimensions are measured by the order and organization, rule clarity, teacher control, and innovation subscales.

Definitions for the nine subscales are (1) involvement - the extent to which students are attentive and interested in class activities, participate in discussions,

and do additional work on their own; (2) affiliation - the level of friendship students feel for each other, as expressed by getting to know each other, helping each other with homework, and enjoying working together; (3) teacher support - the amount of help and friendship the teacher manifests toward students, and how much the teacher talks openly with students, trusts them, and is interested in their ideas; (4) task orientation - the amount of emphasis on completing planned activities and staying on the subject matter; (5) competition - how much students compete with each other for grades and recognition and how hard it is to achieve good grades; (6) order and organization - the emphasis on students behaving in an orderly and polite manner and on the overall organization of assignments and classroom activities; (7) rule clarity - the emphasis on establishing and following a clear set of rules and on students knowing what the consequences will be if they do not follow them, and the extent to which the teacher is consistent in dealing with students who break rules; (8) teacher control - how strict the teacher is in enforcing the rules, the severity of punishment for rule infractions, and how much students get into trouble in the class; and (9) innovation - how much students contribute to planning classroom activities, and the extent to which the teacher uses new techniques and encourages creative thinking.

There are actually three versions of the questionnaire: (1) the real form (Form R) measures students' and teachers' perceptions of their current classrooms; (2) the ideal form (Form I) measures people's conceptions of ideal classroom learning environments; and (3) the expectations form (Form E) measures people's expectations about classrooms they are about to enter. There is also a short form (Form S), which is composed of the first 36 items on the regular form, including four items from each of the nine subscales. The real form is the only published form. The publisher normally authorizes qualified investigators to reproduce the other forms upon receipt of a written request.

The CES manual, available from the publisher, includes a full discussion to support the instrument's reliability and validity. Norms have been developed based on students in 382 classrooms and teachers in 295 classes.

In addition to the manual, available materials include reusable test booklets, answer sheets, and a scoring key. An annotated bibliography, reference annotations, and a publication entitled A User's Guide to the Social Climate Scales can also be obtained from the publisher.

USE

The CES is designed to be given as a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. Respondents mark their answers on specially designed answer sheets. The CES can also be administered using tape-recorded instructions and items. This format is useful with respondents who cannot read at a grade 6 reading level or have a very short attention span.

The questionnaire takes only 15-20 minutes to complete. Scoring all ten subscales requires only a minute or two per questionnaire. Scoring is accomplished by hand through the use of a template that overlays the answer sheet. No scoring service is available.

A User's Guide to the Social Climate Scales (to be published in early 1987) offers a discussion of the main uses of the CES and other social climate scales. It also describes some procedures that may be helpful in arranging to administer the CES, the effects of respondent anonymity, and the number of students in a classroom who need to answer the CES to obtain a reliable profile. The developer recommends 50 percent random samples to adequately characterize classrooms with 25 or more students.

RESULTS

Individual student results are averaged to obtain a summary classroom score. All comparisons in the CES manual focus on the classroom as the unit of analysis. Although

the presentation of results is left to the individual user, the CES manual does provide two useful guides to assist in presentation and interpretation of the data. The first is a set of norming sample summary statistics (means and standard deviations) for each subscale. These statistics are broken down by content area (English, social studies, science, math, business, and technical). The second guide is a profiling technique that allows users to compare the teacher's response in each classroom with the combined students' responses. By converting to a standard score (through use of a simple conversion table in the manual), it is possible to compare scores from one subscale with another and to see where each subscale score fits relative to the normed sample.

While the primary use of results from the CES has been by researchers to address basic questions about the social environments of a wide range of organizations, CES data can also be used to describe and compare different educational programs, conduct formative evaluations, and monitor the impact of intervention programs. Examples of each of these applications are offered in the CES manual.

COSTS

A User's Guide to the Social Climate Scales (estimated cost, $4.00); CES manual ($5.00); test booklet (pkg/25) ($4.75) (for 10 or more pkgs., $4.50); answer sheets (pkg/25) ($3.50) (for 10 or more pkgs., $3.25); scoring key ($1.50); Classroom Environment Scale and the University Residence Environment Scale, annotated bibliography (54 entries, 13 pp.) ($2.00); updated reference annotations (for all scales, 1979-1983, 95 pp.) ($6.50). The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

## SCHOOL ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Bruce L. Wilson
William A. Firestone
Robert E. Herriott

DEVELOPER

SAS Program
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
215-574-9300

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The School Assessment Survey (SAS) is a survey instrument developed by Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) over a seven-year period of research begun in 1979. During this time, the SAS has been used to collect information from teachers in more than 400 elementary and secondary schools. It is designed as a school-wide assessment of organizational conditions promoting effectiveness and improvement. It is most useful for identifying a school's strengths and weaknesses, stimulating discussion, and setting priorities for school improvement planning.

DESCRIPTION

The SAS is an instrument that elicits teachers' perceptions about organizational conditions in their schools. A variety of response formats are used (e.g., rankings, multiple choice, frequency counts). Nine organizational dimensions are assessed by the instrument. Each dimension is composed of five to eight questionnaire items. The nine dimensions and number of items for each are as follows: (1) goal consensus (7 items); (2) facilitative leadership (6 items); (3) centralization of influence, classroom instruction (5 items); (4) centralization of influence, curriculum and resources (5 items); (5) vertical communication (6 items); (6) horizontal communication (6 items); (7) staff conflict (7 items); (8) student discipline (7 items); and (9) teaching behavior (6 items).

In addition to the 11-page questionnaire, the SAS includes a technical manual with

extensive support for the instrument's reliability and validity, as well as articles that document its conceptual base and use. The manual is available from RBS.

USE

Administration of the SAS to all teachers in a school is highly recommended. The instrument can be completed in 30 minutes. Administration is best accomplished in a large-group setting (e.g., staff meeting). The SAS can be administered at any time during the school year, but administrators are discouraged from using it very early in the school year or near a critical event (e.g., a strike).

All processing of data is done by RBS. RBS mails to schools the required number of instruments with clearly specified guidelines for administration. Completed surveys are returned to RBS where the data are analyzed, and summary reports are prepared.

RESULTS

Results from the SAS are presented in three ways: a profile, a written summary, and an item analysis. Since the focus of the instrument is the assessment of overall organizational conditions, the emphasis in the results is on school scores and patterns of responses rather than individual teacher responses. A school score is obtained by averaging all the teachers' scores for each questionnaire item and then averaging all the school item scores within each dimension.

A school profile graphically shows the school scores for each of the nine organizational dimensions. The dimension scores are standardized and displayed in a way that allows comparisons of a school with other similar schools and comparisons of one organizational dimension in a school with another.

The written summary highlights key features from the profile. It is short and nonevaluative, since RBS staff do not have enough information about the school's context to provide an extensive interpretation.

The item analysis illustrates in tabular form the distribution of teacher responses to all questionnaire items in each dimension. These results allow school staff to further analyze how a school dimension score was obtained, review the variation of teacher responses, and pinpoint specific areas for potential improvement.

In addition to providing the data summary, RBS is available to offer training and follow-up assistance. Beyond developing an in-depth understanding of conditions in a school based on the data, the training helps participants to utilize practical techniques for school improvement. While training programs are tailored to the specific needs of individual groups, topics might include teaming, problem-solving, managing change, leadership, or communication.

**COSTS**

School Assessment Survey: Information for School Improvement, which provides an overview of the instrument, is available from RBS free of charge. The technical manual costs $20.00.

Costs per school include copies of the instrument, data processing, and report preparation. These costs vary, depending upon the number of teachers involved: less than 15 teachers ($150), 16-25 teachers ($225), 26-40 teachers ($300), 41-60 teachers ($400), and 61-80 teachers ($525) (each teacher beyond 80, add $6).

**COMMENTS**

For additional information, individuals are encouraged to consult the following:

Wilson, B. L. (1985). The School Assessment Survey. Educational Leadership, 42(6), 50-53.

## ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY

Samuel B. Bacharach
Scott C. Bauer
Sharon C. Conley
Joseph B. Shedd

DEVELOPER

Organizational Analysis and Practice
120 East Buffalo Street
Ithaca, NY 14850
607-273-3033

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Organizational Climate Survey (OCS) is a multidimensional survey of school staffs' perceptions of their work and work environment. A core set of concepts is addressed in a questionnaire completed by all adults in a school, including administrators, teachers, support staff, aides, clerical staff, and janitors. A more extensive questionnaire that addresses a broader range of concepts is available for teachers. Both questionnaires are appropriate for the elementary and secondary levels. The OCS grew out of a larger program of research, conducted over the past nine years, that uses the private business sector literature on organizational climate to help inform conditions in schools.

DESCRIPTION

The OCS adapts concepts and measures from the organizational literature to fit the schooling context. The survey uses multiple items to measure each of nine broad concepts. For some concepts, multiple indicators have also been developed. The concepts and indicators include (1) work processes (routinization, formalization, autonomy, role conflict, role ambiguity); (2) communication* (among peers, with superiors); (3) supervision (critical supervisory behavior, supportive supervisory behavior, unhelpful supervisory behavior); (4) goal setting and consensus*; (5) decision-making* (level of involvement, decision deprivation); (6) resources*; (7) job satisfaction; (8) commitment to career; and (9) relationships with students* (student behavior, student

capability to learn). (The asterisked items are found only on the expanded teacher's questionnaire.)

Data from organizational settings other than schools provide support for the reliability and validity of the survey.

Materials include a ten-page teacher questionnaire, from which measures can be added or deleted as appropriate for particular client needs, and an eight-page core questionnaire for the remaining role groups. Instructions for administration are provided.

USE

Administration of the questionnaire requires approximately 30 minutes. Responses are recorded directly on the questionnaire. Completed forms are returned to the developers for scoring, analysis of results, and preparation of a written report. The entire process takes approximately two months. Either a single school or entire district may participate. All teachers in a school building are encouraged to complete the questionnaire.

While the focus of the OCS is only on the early stages of the improvement process (i.e., data collection to empirically assess current conditions), consulting assistance from the developers is available to facilitate the problem-solving, implementation, and evaluation phases of the process.

RESULTS

Results are presented on a school-by-school basis, since that is the locus of change from the developers' perspective. Schools receive a 25-page report broken into nine sections coinciding with the nine key concepts being measured. Each section is a combination of narrative, graphics, and tables. The narrative begins with a discussion of what each measure is, where it comes from, and why it is important. The data are presented in a variety of formats, including pie charts, bar graphs, and summary tables broken down by key

subgroups. The data presentation is followed by an interpretation section.

The results are designed for use as a diagnostic tool to help focus discussions of organizational change. Schools are encouraged to think of the information as baseline data and to consider future data-collection efforts to obtain a longitudinal perspective on the work environment in schools.

A full-day feedback session is offered by the Organizational Analysis and Practice staff to the school or district to help initiate the problem-solving process that should emerge from a review of the data.

COSTS

The cost varies depending on the size of the district, the revisions to meet local conditions, and the degree of involvement of the developers beyond report preparation and initial feedback. A typical district with 500 employees across all role groups can expect to pay approximately $10,000 for the basic services.

## SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT

CFK Ltd.

DEVELOPER

Phi Delta Kappa
Box 789
Bloomington, IN 47402
812-339-1156

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

School Climate Improvement (SCI) is a three-step process to provide leadership for developing lasting and significant improvements in school climate at the elementary and secondary levels. It was developed by CFK Ltd., a philanthropic foundation dedicated to improving administrative leadership and the learning climate of elementary and secondary schools. CFK Ltd. is no longer in operation, but the process is disseminated through Phi Delta Kappa (PDK). Ideas for the SCI process were drawn from a group of 200 school administrators involved in school climate improvement endeavors throughout the nation in 1973. The process is designed for educational leaders -- principals, superintendents, and other school administrators -- who want to take action to improve school climate.

OVERVIEW

The first step in the SCI process is aimed at establishing an understanding of school climate. Climate, in this process, is viewed as consisting of eight factors that result from the interaction of a school's program, processes, and physical conditions. These factors are (1) respect, (2) trust, (3) high morale, (4) opportunities for input, (5) continuous growth, (6) cohesiveness, (7) school renewal, and (8) caring.

The SCI process also views the climate of a school as the result of 18 key features of a school. These 18 features, referred to as determinants, include: Program - opportunities for active learning, individualized performance expectations, varied learning environments, flexible curriculum and extracurricular activities, support and

DESCRIPTION

structure appropriate to a learner's maturity, cooperatively determined rules, and varied reward systems. Process - problem-solving ability, improvement of school goals, identifying and working with conflicts, effective communications, involvement in decision-making, autonomy with accountability, effective teaching-learning strategies, and ability to plan for the future. Material - adequate resources, supportive and efficient logistical system, and suitability of school plant.

In addition to establishing an understanding of climate, the first step in the SCI process involves the administration of an instrument (the School Climate Profile) that can be used to assess the opinions of teachers, students, administrators, support staff, and parents. There are five indicators for each of the eight climate factors and 18 climate determinants. Each respondent is asked to indicate "what is" and "what should be" for each indicator. A four-point scale is used, from "almost never" to "almost always."

The instrument is designed to serve two purposes: (1) to provide a convenient means of assessing school climate factors and determinants so that initial decisions can be made about priority targets for improvement projects, and (2) to serve as a benchmark against which a school may measure climate change. It is not intended as an exhaustive survey, but rather as an overview that can help educators decide what factors and determinants should be looked at more intensively.

No reliability or validity data are provided for the instrument.

The second step of the SCI process focuses on the role of the school administrator in the development of school climate. The premise of this step is that "a school is the shadow of its administrator." Three options are proposed: (1) an assessment of the administrator, (2) an assessment of the school, and (3) a joint assessment of the administrator and the school. Once an

option is chosen, work can begin toward six sequential goals: (1) expanding one's understanding of school climate and the leader's role in creating it, (2) deciding on the nature of commitment to the task, (3) clarifying the leadership role to be assumed, (4) identifying and prioritizing climate problems in a school, (5) involving people in improving school climate, and (6) designing and implementing maintenance and feedback systems for those involved in school climate improvement. The SCI process outlines several options for attaining each of the goals and a number of useful "how to go about it" tips.

The third step of the process involves the actual implementation of school climate projects. Twenty-five different activities that may be undertaken are described.

The SCI process, including the School Climate Profile, is described in detail in a book entitled School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, available from PDK.

USE

The shape that the SCI process takes in any school will vary, depending upon the choices made by those following the process. There are no timelines offered.

The School Climate Profile takes 20-25 minutes to administer. It should be administered to students, teachers, administrators, support staff, and parents so that people with different perspectives may have input. Scoring of the results is done by individual users. Directions are provided in School Climate Improvement.

RESULTS

A useful summary profile is presented in School Climate Improvement that allows an administrator to address a number of key questions, including: (1) Which climate factors or determinants are lowest or highest on the scale? (2) For which climate factors or determinants are the discrepancies between "what is" and "what should be" the largest? and (3) Are there marked discrepan-

cies between how one role group ranks a climate factor or determinant and how it is ranked by another role group?

COSTS

The cost of School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator is $3.00. The cost of implementing the SCI process, including administration of the instrument, cannot be estimated, but it should be minimal.

COMMENTS

An updated version of the SCI process will be published by PDK in March 1987.

## QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE

DEVELOPER

Joyce L. Epstein
James M. McPartland
Johns Hopkins University

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

Riverside Publishing Company
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Chicago, IL 60631
800-323-9540

OVERVIEW

The Quality of School Life (QSL) is a multidimensional survey instrument of student reactions to school in general, to their classwork, and to their teachers. It was developed by researchers at Johns Hopkins University in the mid-1970s. It is designed for use with students in grades 4-12 to help teachers, administrators, and researchers formally measure students' reactions to school, describe and monitor the conditions of school life, and make decisions about the success of school programs. QSL data can be used for a variety of purposes, depending on classroom, school, and district needs.

DESCRIPTION

Three subscales form the 27-item QSL. The first subscale, satisfaction with school, includes five items that examine students' general reactions to school. The commitment to classwork subscale of 11 items deals with the level of student interest in classwork. The final 11-item subscale, reactions to teachers, examines student evaluations of instructional and personal interactions with teachers. The QSL items include true/false and multiple-choice questions.

Detailed analyses that attest to the QSL's reliability and validity are presented in an administration and technical manual available from the publisher. There are no national norms available for the QSL, but there are research norms based on a sample of 4,266 students at elementary and secondary grade levels in a single district. Charac-

teristics of that sample are offered in the administration and technical manual to permit users to consider whether the research sample is appropriate for comparison with local students or groups. Tables of research normed data allow schools to make comparisons based on such variables as gender, race, socioeconomic status, and achievement. Procedures for developing local norms are also included in the manual.

USE

The QSL questionnaire is administered and scored by local staff. It may be administered to small or large groups of students in about 20 minutes. Answers are written directly on the questionnaire booklet. Most students in grades 4-12 can read and interpret the items without difficulty. Students who request help in reading a word or phrase should be individually assisted. Detailed directions for administration are provided in the administration and technical manual.

Scoring is straightforward, with each item worth "1" or "0." "1" is the score for a clearly positive evaluation of a school experience. A raw score for each subscale and the overall scale is calculated by simply counting up the number of positive assessments. A scoring template is available. Scoring instructions are provided in the manual.

RESULTS

Results can be reported for each of the three subscales, as well as for all 27 items. The results can be displayed to assess either individual or group scores. Group scores may include classrooms, grade levels, schools, or districts.

The use of QSL results depends on the needs of the classroom, school, or district. At the simplest level, QSL data provide a descriptive gauge of the general affective condition of education perceived by individual students or groups of students. At a more sophisticated level, information from the QSL may be used in an evaluative context, along with other measures of student back-

ground, behavior, or achievement. Some other uses of the QSL include identifying potential dropouts, identifying other groups for different treatment, providing information for use in individual counseling, and research.

COSTS

Questionnaire folder: packet of 35 questionnaire booklets, scoring key, administration and technical manual ($11.13); packet of 100 questionnaire booklets ($24.03). The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

## LEARNING ENVIRONMENT INVENTORY/MY CLASS INVENTORY

Barry J. Fraser
Garry J. Anderson
Herbert J. Walberg

DEVELOPER

Herbert J. Walberg
College of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL 60680
312-996-8133

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) measures student perceptions of dimensions of the social climate of secondary school classrooms. A simplified version, My Class Inventory (MCI), measures a subset of climate dimensions and is suitable for students in the eight- to twelve-year age range. Development of the LEI began in the late 1960s in conjunction with the evaluation of, and research on, Harvard's Project Physics, a high school physics curriculum. The LEI/MCI is used either to assess the perceptions of individual students or to gauge the learning environment of the class as a whole. Although it has been used primarily as a research or evaluation tool in numerous studies involving students from around the world, information from the LEI/MCI has also been useful in assessment and diagnosis.

DESCRIPTION

The LEI contains 15 scales of school climate. Each scale is created by combining responses to seven questionnaire items for a total of 105 items. Students respond to each question on a four-point scale: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree. The 15 scales include (1) cohesiveness - extent to which students, know, help, and are friendly toward each other; (2) diversity - extent to which differences in students' interests exist and are provided for; (3) formality - extent to which behavior within the class is guided by formal rules; (4) speed - extent to which class work is covered quickly; (5) material environment -

availability of adequate books, equipment, space, and lighting; (6) friction - amount of tension and quarrelling among students; (7) goal direction - degree of goal clarity in the class; (8) favoritism - extent to which the teacher treats certain students more favorably than others; (9) difficulty - extent to which students find difficulty with the work of the class; (10) apathy - extent to which students feel no affinity with the class activities; (11) democracy - extent to which students share equally in decision-making related to the class; (12) cliqueness - extent to which students refuse to mix with the rest of the class; (13) satisfaction - extent of enjoyment of class work; (14) disorganization - extent to which classroom activities are confusing and poorly organized; and (15) competitiveness - emphasis on students competing with each other.

The MCI differs from the LEI in four important ways designed to enhance its use with younger children. First, the MCI contains only five of the LEI's 15 scales. The five MCI scales, which include a total of 38 items, are (1) cohesiveness (6 items), (2) friction (8 items), (3) difficulty (8 items), (4) satisfaction (9 items), and (5) competitiveness (7 items). Second, item wording is simplified to enhance readability. Third, the response format is reduced to "yes" or "no." Finally, students write their answers on the questionnaire rather than on a separate answer sheet that is provided with the LEI.

A large number of research studies have been conducted that document the reliability and validity of the instruments. A discussion of these studies is presented in Assessment of Learning Environments, Manual for LEI and MCI, which is available from the developer. Norms have been developed for the LEI based on 1,048 students in 61 classrooms, and for the MCI, on 2,305 students in 100 classrooms.

The LEI/MCI manual also contains copies of each instrument and all the information

needed to administer, score (both by machine and by hand), and interpret results from either instrument.

The LEI and MCI can both be administered in classroom settings. Students completing the LEI use separate response sheets to record their answers. Students answer MCI questions directly on the questionnaire booklet. The amount of time needed to complete the questionnaire varies with age. From 40 to 55 minutes should be allowed for grade 7 students completing the LEI and only 20-35 minutes for grade 12 students. Between 15 and 30 minutes is required to complete the MCI questionnaire.

USE

Questionnaires can be scored by machine or by hand. Scoring is done by the teacher, school, or district using the instruments.

Item scores can be grouped to establish total scale scores for each student, and student scores can be totaled to obtain a classroom score. Both student and classroom scores can be compared to those of the norming sample. Frequency distributions are also provided for the norming sample, so that users can get a sense not only of mean scores but also of the range of responses.

RESULTS

The LEI and MCI have been used primarily for research purposes. To a lesser degree, information from the instruments has been used for the assessment of educational innovations, new curricula, and particular teaching approaches and school organizations. The least frequent use of the data has been for diagnostic purposes or as a tool to guide school improvement efforts.

Assessment of Learning Environments: Manual for LEI and MCI is available free of charge. The instruments can be duplicated at local expense. The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

COSTS

## MIDDLE GRADES ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Gayle Dorman

DEVELOPER

Center for Early Adolescence
University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill
Suite 223, Carr Mill Mall
Carrboro, NC 27510
919-966-1148

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

The Middle Grades Assessment Program (MGAP) provides an information base, assessment instruments, and a participatory process for school-based self-assessment and improvement at the junior high or middle school level. Based on research on early adolescent development, academically effective schools, and educational change, the most recent version of MGAP was completed in 1985. MGAP results can be used to produce a comprehensive report on the current status of a school and an action plan for school improvement.

DESCRIPTION

The MGAP process includes observations of a school and interviews with school staff, students, and parents. All observation items and interview questions are keyed to the academic and developmental needs of adolescents: safety, academic effectiveness, diversity, self-exploration, participation, social interaction, physical activity, competence and achievement, and structure and clear limits.

There are seven Interview Forms, one each for teachers, guidance counselors, students, school support staff, and parents, a general form for the principal, and a form for the principal that deals specifically with the curriculum. On each form are from 6 to 23 ideals, each addressed by several open-ended questions. Examples of ideals are: "The principal is the instructional leader," "All students have an opportunity for success at something," and "There is a generally accepted school philosophy."

The Observation Form consists of 84 statements that deal with physical facilities, classroom instruction, physical education classes, media center/library, student rules and expectations, and general school environment. In general, observers are to respond "yes" or "no" to the statement. In some cases, additional information is requested.

No studies of reliability or validity of the MGAP forms have been conducted.

MGAP materials available from the developer include a user's manual that describes early adolescent development, reviews the research on academic effectiveness, and contains the Interview and Observation Forms and a comprehensive bibliography and resource list. A leader's manual for assessment team leaders presents information on how to train people to use MGAP procedures. Also available is a slide/tape program that reviews early adolescent development and school responsiveness, and shows team members how they can sharpen their observation and interviewing skills.

USE

MGAP is designed for use by an assessment team composed of individuals from the school staff and possibly parents, district administrators, and school board members. The team should be no larger than 18-20 members. Generally, the principal of the school forms the team and serves as an active or ex officio member. He/she is assisted by one or two team leaders, usually staff members.

The assessment can be conducted over a two- to four-month period. Each team member is required to complete the following tasks: (1) attend three training sessions (10-12 hours), (2) conduct observations and interviews (10-15 hours), (3) complete data summaries (2-3 hours), and (4) attend Sharing and Summarizing Sessions (6-12 hours). The amount of time required to produce a report and plan of action depends on many factors, such as the number of people involved and the process used.

Various MGAP training and technical assistance services, as well as information services, are available from the developer.

RESULTS

Members of the assessment team complete Summarizing Sheets following their interviews and observations. The sheets guide each team member in checking for consistency among answers to similar questions asked of different people and in summarizing data and reaching conclusions related to each of the nine MGAP needs.

Data are discussed at Sharing and Summarizing Sessions held soon after the school visit. In addition to providing an opportunity for sharing individual data, the sessions are designed so that team members can (1) reach group consensus about the school's responsiveness to the MGAP needs, (2) brainstorm possible actions that might make the school more responsive, (3) decide priorities for study and/or action, and (4) plan a process for sharing conclusions and priorities and for developing a specific school improvement plan.

COSTS

An MGAP package (10 user's manuals, a leader's manual, and the slide/tape program) is available for $155. Single item prices are: user's manual ($10), leader's manual ($20), and slide/tape ($75). Training and technical assistance costs vary, depending on the specific service desired. Information services are available free of charge to schools using MGAP.

COMMENTS

For additional information, individuals are encouraged to consult the following:

Dorman, G., Lipsitz, J., & Verner, P. (1985). Improving schools for young adolescents. Educational Leadership, 42(6), 44-49.

## VI. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

This section of the directory contains descriptions of instruments and processes that address parent and/or community relations with schools. In all cases, information is collected on involvement in schools, as well as on perceptions of school effectiveness. Few instruments and processes related to school-community relations have been developed that meet the criteria for inclusion in this directory, but, as with administrator performance, research and development work in this area is intensifying.

One caution -- sampling is extremely important in the collection of data from parents and community members. Steps must be taken to ensure that the respondents to any instrument accurately reflect the population of parents or community members associated with a school or district.

The following instruments and processes are included in the directory:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| • Parent Attitudes Toward School Effectiveness Questionnaire | VI-2 |
| • Project ACCESS | VI-4 |
| • NCCE Parent Involvement Process | VI-8 |


In Section V of this directory are five entries that also include the collection of data on parent perceptions of their children's school. These entries are: Santa Clara School Effectiveness Program Surveys, Illinois Quality Schools Index, School Self-Assessment Instruments, School Climate Improvement, and Middle Grades Assessment Program.

## PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

**DEVELOPER**

Bureau of Research and Service
University of Connecticut

**CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION**

Christopher Hall
Connecticut State Department of
Children and Youth Services
170 Sigourney Street
Hartford, CT 06105
203-566-8180

**OVERVIEW**

The Parent Attitudes Toward School Effectiveness (PATSE) questionnaire was developed in 1985 by the University of Connecticut under contract to the Connecticut State Department of Children and Youth Services. PATSE assesses the attitudes of parents of secondary school students toward the effectiveness of their children's school and the school's relations with parents. Development of PATSE was based on reviews of the literature and experience in instrument development efforts conducted in conjunction with the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project (see Section V of this directory). Data from the questionnaire can be used in planning school improvement activities, including activities designed to enhance home-school partnerships.

**DESCRIPTION**

The PATSE questionnaire consists of two parts. Part I requests background information about parents' visits to the school, level of education, sex, and number of parents and children living at home. Part II consists of 47 statements that tap attitudes in six categories: (1) school and community relationships, (2) clear school mission, (3) high expectations, (4) safe and orderly environment, (5) instructional leadership, and (6) frequent monitoring of student progress. Between five and eleven statements are included for each category. Parents are to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement. A five-point scale is used: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and

strongly disagree. Both English and Spanish versions of the questionnaire are available.

Preliminary data available from the Department of Children and Youth Services support the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

USE

PATSE is designed to be completed by parents at home or during time set aside at school functions (e.g., open houses, parent conferences). Approximately 20 minutes is required.

Scoring can be done by the school or district. No directions are provided, but the task is relatively straightforward.

RESULTS

Two sample score reports are suggested. The first report presents, for each item, the percentage of parents selecting each of the five options and the mean score for that item. A mean score for each category is also presented. In the second suggested report, the response categories are collapsed into three categories (strongly agree/agree, undecided, and strongly disagree/disagree). For each item, the percentage of parents agreeing, disagreeing, and undecided is reported, along with a mean score for each item and for each category.

PATSE results can be useful in overall school improvement efforts, as well as in activities targeted toward enhancing a school's relationship with parents.

COSTS

A reproducible copy of the questionnaire and a technical assistance manual are available from the Department of Children and Youth Services at no cost. The questionnaire can be duplicated at local expense. The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in administration, scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

COMMENTS

A second edition of the questionnaire is under development.

## PROJECT ACCESS

Citizens Education Center Northwest — DEVELOPER

Project ACCESS
Citizens Education Center Northwest
105 South Main Street, Suite 327
Seattle, WA 98104
206-624-9955

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

Citizens Education Center Northwest is a statewide nonprofit organization that has been encouraging citizen leadership in improving public education since 1979. An area of particular concern for the Center is community-based involvement in decision-making. In 1981, Citizens Education Center Northwest and the Seattle School District, supported by grants from the Ford Foundation, launched Project ACCESS (A Community Cooperating for Effective Seattle Schools) to learn more about citizen involvement in the schools and, subsequently, to implement innovative strategies for involving citizens in school-based decision-making. Three separate instruments targeted at parents, community members, and school staff were developed to seek answers to such questions as: (1) What is the current level of citizen involvement? (2) Who is involved and in what ways? (3) What roles would citizens like to play in their schools? (4) What roles would educators like them to play? and (5) What are the barriers that prevent citizens from being more involved?

The report from Project ACCESS, District-Wide Community Profile, 1982, serves as a useful example for districts interested in documenting parent and community involvement in their schools.

DESCRIPTION

In Project ACCESS, data were collected from parents, community members, and school staff. The views of nearly 1,600 parents were sought through telephone interviews. Parents differing in ethnic background, income, marital status, and degree of choice in selecting their children's school were included.

Four areas were covered in the parent interviews. First, parents were asked to grade their children's school with respect to (1) whether the school informs parents about meetings and activities, (2) whether the school informs parents about school rules and policies, (3) whether the school lets parents know how their children are doing, (4) whether the school makes parents feel as if their opinion counts, and (5) whether the school meets children's educational needs. The second set of questions focused on parent involvement. Parents were asked about the amount of time they spent assisting their children with homework, the frequency of parent-staff contact, and the level of parent involvement in school activities. The third area covered in the interviews was parents' degree of involvement in, and their evaluation of, special committees designed to increase parent participation in decision-making. The final set of questions concerned perceived barriers to increased involvement by parents.

Community input was sought by ACCESS through on-site interviews with over 550 people in businesses and community organizations. Six areas were addressed in the interviews: (1) knowledge of their local schools, (2) contact with local schools during the past three years, (3) interest in serving on school committees to help make decisions and set policies, (4) extent to which local schools meet children's educational needs, (5) interest in using school facilities, and (6) ways in which local schools can be of assistance to the community.

Staff views on parent and community involvement were obtained through a questionnaire survey. Approximately 150 questionnaires were completed by teachers, administrators, counselors, librarians, secretaries, and nurses. All role groups completed the same instrument. The areas covered were (1) ways in which information is communicated to the community, (2) parent roles in the school, (3) degree of parent participation in the school, and (4) barriers to increasing parent involvement.

No reliability or validity data are available on any of the instruments.

All three instruments are reproduced in an appendix to the ACCESS report. The report is available from Citizens Education Center Northwest.

USE

The parent interview was designed to last ten minutes, but some interviews took as long as 20 minutes. Details on the procedures developed for conducting parent interviews are provided in an appendix to the ACCESS report. The community interview was also designed to last ten minutes, but people eager to share their views spent up to one hour talking with interviewers. Cautions are provided about the need to train interviewers carefully. Detailed procedures are not provided, but a useful set of nine "Suggestions for Successful Community Surveying" is offered in the report. The short staff survey takes only a few minutes to complete. While the report encourages the sampling of staff views, no detailed guidelines or procedures are presented.

No information is offered as to how to process the data.

RESULTS

Data in the ACCESS report are displayed in three useful ways. First, total district-wide aggregated means are provided. Second, comparisons are made of the responses of parents differing in grade level, ethnicity, neighborhood of origin, income, and marital status. Finally, two-page individual narrative profiles are provided that summarize parents' views for each of the 22 schools involved in the study.

A useful addition to the report is the inclusion of a "Questions to Consider" section after each data presentation. The questions are posed to stimulate discussion regarding further citizen involvement in defining and achieving educational quality.

The 110-page ACCESS report, District-Wide Community Profile, 1982, is available from Citizens Education Center Northwest for $10.00. In addition, an 18-page summary, Involving Citizens in Seattle Schools: Highlights of a Community Survey, is available from the Center for $5.00.

Instruments can be duplicated at local expense. The only other costs to a school system are those incurred in administration, scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.

## NCCE PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

DEVELOPER

Anne T. Henderson
Carl L. Marburger
Theodora Ooms

CONTACT FOR MATERIALS AND INFORMATION

The National Committee for
Citizens in Education
Suite 410
Wilde Lake Village Green
Columbia, MD 21044
301-997-9300

OVERVIEW

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) is a private, nonprofit organization devoted exclusively to improving the quality of public schools through increased involvement of parents and citizens. During its 13 years of existence, NCCE has gathered a wealth of information to assist parents and citizens in becoming more involved in educational matters. In 1986, this information was summarized in a book entitled Beyond the Bake Sale: An Educator's Guide to Working With Parents that describes a process for improved school-community relations. The process is targeted for professional educators, concerned parents, and community members. Instruments for parents' assessment of schools are included.

DESCRIPTION

The NCCE process for enhancing parent and community involvement in education is organized around six key issues: (1) What roles can parents play? (2) What principles should guide a collaboration? (3) What gets in the way of parent involvement? (4) How can parents assess their schools? (5) What procedures and activities help promote parent involvement? and (6) What policies help promote parent involvement? Each issue is addressed in some detail in Beyond the Bake Sale.

The issue of parent roles is dealt with by the conceptualization of five types of involvement: (1) Partners - parents performing basic obligations for their child's

education and social development; (2) Collaborators and Problem-Solvers - parents reinforcing the school's efforts with their child and helping to solve problems; (3) Audience - parents attending to and appreciating the school's (and their child's) performance; (4) Supporters - parents providing volunteer assistance to teachers, the parent organization, and other parents; and (5) Advisors and/or Co-Decision-Makers - parents providing input on school policies and programs through membership in ad hoc or permanent governance bodies.

Seven principles are identified as essential to a parent-school partnership: (1) every aspect of the school climate is open, helpful, and friendly; (2) communications with parents are frequent, clear, and two-way; (3) parents are treated as collaborators in the educational process, with a strong complementary role to play in their children's school learning and behavior; (4) parents are encouraged to comment on school policies and to share in the decision-making; (5) the school recognizes its responsibility to forge a partnership with all families in the school, not simply those most easily available; (6) the principal and other school administrators actively express and promote the philosophy of partnership with all families; and (7) the school encourages volunteer participation from parents and the community-at-large. Specific examples are offered for each principle to give educators ideas about how to implement them in their own school.

The issue of barriers to parent involvement is developed in some detail. One chapter discusses educators' attitudes, indicating a continuum from a closed system where no outsiders are permitted to an open system where collaboration is actively sought. A useful set of paired questions eliciting perspectives from each end of the continuum is offered to help educators assess their own position. Other chapters offer details on such barriers as logistics, money, safety, child care, and district policies. Helpful hints are provided for administrators and teachers as a means to encourage a

positive message to parents and community members regarding their acceptance in the school.

Assessment of schools is accomplished by the use of four checklists that different groups of people -- parents, teachers, students, administrators, counselors, and other staff -- are asked to respond to. The first checklist focuses on 35 items addressing key characteristics of the school. The six categories of items include physical characteristics, location, relations, facility as a resource, school's reputation, and special features. The second checklist addresses key characteristics of families in the school. The 27 items are organized into eight categories: parent marital status, family disruptions, socioeconomic status, racial/cultural background, parent employment, child supervision, family mobility, and student special needs. The third checklist assesses the family-school relationship as organized around the seven principles of the parent-school partnership. There are 56 items in this checklist. The final checklist, organized around six of the seven principles (excluding a philosophy of partnership), contains 30 items pertaining to the parent-teacher relationship.

The family characteristics checklist requires estimating percentages or selecting a best choice. Answers for the other three checklists are all "yes" or "no."

Eight specific procedures are offered to help promote parent and community involvement: (1) appointment of at least a half-time coordinator for activities, (2) assessment of needs and resources, (3) development of a common understanding about the roles parents and staff will play, (4) active recruitment of parents, (5) training for parents and staff, (6) establishment of several communication channels, (7) provision of continuing support services, and (8) allotment of frequent opportunities for evaluation and feedback.

The final issue -- policies that promote parent involvement -- is addressed by sets of specific actions that can be taken at the local, state, and federal levels to encourage parent and community involvement.

Beyond the Bake Sale, which is available from NCCE, also includes information about research on families and schools and an annotated list of resources.

A handbook, Your School: How Well Is It Working, is also available from NCCE. The handbook complements the ideas in Beyond the Bake Sale and is designed to help parents initiate and carry out an assessment of their school.

USE

Concrete examples are scattered throughout Beyond the Bake Sale to help educators apply the concepts to their own situation. There is no information provided on the use of the checklists other than an indication that as many groups as possible should be involved.

RESULTS

No information is offered on how to report checklist data.

COSTS

Prepaid orders for Beyond the Bake Sale cost $10.95. For invoiced requests, the cost is $10.95 plus postage. Prepaid orders for Your School: How Well Is It Working cost $4.50. Individual districts can duplicate the checklists at their own expense. The only other costs to a school system related to the checklists are those incurred in administration, scoring, and analysis and interpretation of results.